Special "Peace" Number

UNIVERSITY OF

The ARYAN PATH

Vol. X. JANUARY 1939 No. 1.

CONTENTS

	Page
The Impending Doom and the Way Out	1
The Foundations of European Peace—*By Sir Norman Angell*... ...	4
Industrialization: Violence is Essential to It—*By J. C. Kumarappa*	9
Right Economics for World Peace—*By Richard B. Gregg*	14
Race Prejudice and War—*By Lord Olivier*	18
Peace Between the White and the Black Races:	
I.—The Negroes of the U. S. A.—*By Alain Locke*	22
II.—In Dark Africa—*By William Harrison*	25
Peace Between Jews and Gentiles—*By Cecil Roth*	30
World Peace: Britain and Her Brown Millions—*By D. F. Karaka* ...	34
The Writer in Relation to War and Peace—*By Hermon Ould* ...	38
Youth and the Basis of Peace—*By Kwaja Ahmad Abbas*	43
Women and Peace: "Violence Is Old Fashioned"—*By Stella Gibbons*	46
America and World Peace—*By James Truslow Adams*	48
Cruelty and World Peace—*By Hamilton Fyfe*	52
The Churches and World Peace: The Betrayal of Christ —*By Gerald Bullett*	55
The War-Machine—*By L. P. Jacks*	58
Educating and Organizing for Peace:	
I.—Community of Blood or of Thought—*By H. N. Brailsford* ...	62
II.—Free Trade and Disarmament—*By C. E. M. Joad*	65
The Way of Satyagraha—*By P. Mahadevan*	69
T. L. Crombie	72

51, ESPLANADE ROAD - - - - BOMBAY, INDIA

THE ARYAN PATH

51, Esplanade Road, Bombay, India

17, Great Cumberland Place, London W. I.

CONTRIBUTIONS:—Contributions submitted for publication should be typewritten, on one side of the paper only, with wide margin, and copies should be in all cases retained by the writers, as no manuscripts are returned.

The Editors hold themselves responsible for unsigned articles only. They are not necessarily in agreement with the views of their contributors, to whom they leave free expression of opinion.

CORRESPONDENCE:—Letters from subscribers and readers are welcome, with criticisms, comments or questions on any subject treated in the Magazine. Questions on Theosophical Philosophy and History will be replied to direct, or, if of sufficient general interest, in the pages of THE ARYAN PATH.

SUBSCRIPTIONS:—THE ARYAN PATH is published monthly. No subscriptions are accepted for less than twelve months, but subscriptions may begin with any desired number. All orders should be accompanied by the necessary remittance to the Manager, THE ARYAN PATH. Price: In India, single copy As. 12; per annum Rs. 6. In Europe, single copy 1*s.* 6*d.*; per annum 12*s.* or equivalent. In America, single copy 35 cents; per annum $3; all post free. Back numbers are obtainable on special application.

THE THEOSOPHICAL MOVEMENT

THIS monthly publication of 16 pages blends the past and the present by reprinting old articles from H. P. B.'s *Theosophist* and *Lucifer*, and W. Q. Judge's *Path*, as well as throwing the light of Theosophy on modern events. All articles are of practical interest.

Principal Contents for December 1938

"Act For and As the Self"
Scent Photography
Progress and Culture—*By H. P. Blavatsky*
Why the Churches Have Failed
The Work on Ourselves
Symbolism
Where the Rishis Were
Who Has Seen the Wind?
Jewish Ethics—A Comparative Study with Buddhist Paramitas In the Light of Theosophy

Price: As. 2. Annual Subscription: Re. 1, 2*s.*, or 50 cents, post free.

A U M

Point out the "Way"—however dimly,
and lost among the host—as does the evening
star to those who tread their path in darkness.
—*The Voice of the Silence*

THE ARYAN PATH

VOL. X JANUARY 1939 No. 1

THE IMPENDING DOOM AND THE WAY OUT

> Behold on what objects the best energies of knowledge, the strongest human activity and the inventive powers of man are wasted at the present hour : on the creation, amelioration and perfection of war-engines of destruction, on guns and smokeless powders, and weapons for the mutual murder and decimation of men. Great Christian nations seek to outvie each other in the discovery of better means for destroying human life, and for the subjecting by the strongest and the craftiest of the weakest and the simplest, for no better reason than to feed their peacock-vanity and self-adulation ; and Christian men eagerly follow the good example.—H. P. BLAVATSKY (in 1891).

While Mars was being propitiated at Munich by two who love war and two others who fear it, most of our contributors to this number were busy preparing their articles. There is not a rational human being who does not favour peace ; in their speeches politicians and ministers of every state declare themselves to be the votaries of peace—even the dictators are claimants to that rôle though they illogically assert that the way to peace lies through war. But not only are the Dictators illogical : those who are planning to fight, for example Great Britain, and are building up larger armies are also illogical —only in a lesser degree. Many even among those who accept the precept that "hatred ceaseth not by hatred" and agree that "an eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth" is a false doctrine, and not only an immoral one, bow the knee to Moloch,

> .....horrid King, besmear'd with blood
> Of human sacrifice and parents' tears.

Even on the brink of war we continued with our plan of publishing this special Peace number of THE ARYAN PATH, because we have faith in the greater power of peace and order which can transmute the opposing force of carnage and chaos, if only those who speak of "peace in our time" really work for it. The

48.52
V.10
1939

Dictators want war—why expect them to labour for peace? The Democracies aspire to keep peace but are forging weapons of destruction, while constructive planning is badly neglected. To avoid war is not to establish peace. Peace must be worshipped with a whole-hearted devotion; not in blind hope but with a clear intellectual perception must the Goddess be served. Swords are not offerings acceptable to Her.

There are problems which hold tightly the roots of war, *e.g.*, the racial tension (not the artificial one created by Hitler, for between Germans, whatever their creedal belief, and the Jews of Europe there is *no* difference) between the Coloured and the so-called White races; or the clash of cultures between the British and the Indians; or the economic tensions and trade rivalries born of false methods of industrialization—false because immoral. These root problems are examined by some of our contributors. Other articles indicate the parts which youth and women, writers and preachers and great democracies and republics like the U.S.A. can play. The summation in the last articles clearly reveals the right way to lasting peace—the way which the opening article of so profoundly logical and reasonable an advocate of order as Sir Norman Angell finds not only "extremely attractive" but also "much more practicable than would appear at first sight". It is because Non-Violence and Passive Resistance are practicable that we often reiterate the plan of educating the young and the adult in its principles. No nation can build an army or a navy in a short season; after years of preparation Britain found herself unprepared; her unpreparedness for war contributed substantially to the depressing tragedy of Munich. Nor can a nation educate itself in *Ahimsa* and *Satyagraha* in a year; but a beginning can be made. To-day the world may be said to be watching to see which nation will be first in the race, not of armaments, but of developing its inner psychic and moral force. This appears to be a probability to the most proficient and the most experienced teacher of the practice of Non-Violence; see the article of Gandhiji in *Harijan* for 12th November under the caption "Why Not Great Powers?" in which he writes:—

> I had no right to arrogate to myself any belief that India alone and no other nation was fit for non-violent action. I must confess that I have believed and still believe that India was the fittest nation to enforce non-violent action for regaining her freedom. In spite of signs to the contrary, I have the hope that the whole mass of people who are more than the Congress, will respond only to non-violent action. They are the readiest of all the nations of the earth for such action. But when a case for immediate application of the remedy presented itself before me, I could not restrain myself from suggesting it to the Czechs for their acceptance.
>
> It is however open to the great powers to take it up any day and cover themselves with glory and earn the eternal gratitude of posterity. If they or any of them could shed the fear of destruction, if they disarmed themselves, they will automatically help the rest to regain their sanity. But then these great powers have to give up imperialistic ambitions and exploitation of the so-called uncivilised or semi-civilised nations of the earth and revise their mode of life. It means a complete revolution. Great nations can hardly be expected in the

ordinary course to move spontaneously in a direction the reverse of the one they have followed, and according to their notion of value, from victory to victory. But miracles have happened before and may happen even in this very prosaic age. Who can dare limit God's power of undoing wrong? One thing is certain. If the mad race for armaments continues, it is bound to result in a slaughter such as has never occurred in history. If there is a victor left the very victory will be a living death for the nation that emerges victorious. There is no escape from the impending doom save through a bold and unconditional acceptance of the non-violent method with all its glorious implications. Democracy and violence can ill go together. The states that are to-day nominally democratic have either to become frankly totalitarian or, if they are to become truly democratic, they must become courageously non-violent. It is a blasphemy to say that non-violence can only be practised by individuals and never by nations which are composed of individuals.

Ideas rule the world—not politicians in Downing Street or the White House, not even Dictators in Germany and Italy and Russia. It is one of the illusions to which human mind falls prey that legislatures are supreme. Ideas rule politicians and dictators. Ambitious and greedy thoughts obsess people and among them the leaders, who become cross-eyed by their evil feelings and see the world out of focus. Noble and true ideas transform men and women including the politicians.

Educate the people not merely to desire peace but to understand how it can and should be firmly established. This first number of our tenth volume presents ideas which need to be examined and expounded. It is our humble offering on the altar of Universal Brotherhood which makes no distinction between Easterner and Westerner, Jew and Nazi, Heathen and Christian. Humanity is one and the folly of a single member poisons the whole body; contrariwise—the wisdom of a single unit transmutes the whole and elevates it to a higher plane of being.

FENNER BROCKWAY'S PROGRAMME

1. Resistance to rearmament;
2. Resistance to war, whether "democratic", League of Nations, or Collective Security;
3. Resistance to industrial and military conscription and preparatory steps such as the National Register;
4. Support for the colonial workers in their struggle against imperialism;
5. Activity for a new social and international order based on co-operation, justice and freedom.

—*Pacifism and the Left Wing*, (pp. 20-21)

THE FOUNDATIONS OF EUROPEAN PEACE

[Sir Norman Angell, the famous author of a truly epoch-making book, *The Great Illusion,* is a persevering and an indefatigable worker in the cause of Peace. He is an educator of rare parts and has the gift of presenting facts so as to make them self-evident and at most times incontestable. In this article he not only has presented the problem which European civilization has to solve or perish, but also has clearly set forth the principles without which it cannot be solved.—EDS.]

The millions of Europe, the peoples, ardently desire peace. Why then do they get war?

If it be replied that dictators or capitalists or armament makers force them into it against their will, it is clear that we have not examined the meaning of the words we use. A single dictator or a group of twenty, or two hundred, or even two thousand capitalists or armament makers cannot "force" millions. The force is on the side of the millions, not on the side of a dozen or a few score elderly, obese gentlemen. That the obese gentlemen for their own purposes may desire a nation to go to war and tell it so to do, is conceivable. But why does the nation obey, since the power is on the side of the people? The explanation is that *the mind of the people has been captured by certain ideas and values,* by belief in the advantage of conquest; or in glory; or in nationalism, or patriotism; or in the suppression of this or that race or class or party—ideas which the few or the one may exploit. But it is, in the last analysis, by manipulating those things of the mind that men are brought to wage war. In so far as force enters to compel them, *the force which coerces the people is supplied by the people themselves as the result of persuasion;* of capturing their will.

But for the existence of a certain set of ideas in people's minds, special interests would be powerless to push whole nations to war. If, for instance, the building industry (even more considerable than the armament industry) could bring about the destruction by fire of some great city like London, or Birmingham, or Bombay, all concerned in that industry—the manufacturers of bricks, cement, steel, glass and the rest—would make perfectly enormous profits and those who own shares in such industries would make great fortunes. But if the capitalists controlling that industry were to ask the citizens of London or Bombay to burn down those cities, would it be done? It would not. The capitalists in that case are quite impotent to impose their wishes, however ardent those wishes might be. But they are quite successful in imposing their will about the blowing of cities to pieces with bombs, or in inducing the public to buy the instruments for the purpose of doing that thing. How do we account for the fact that in the one case it is so easy to bend the will of the people to the desires of a small minority (if that *is* the explanation

of war) and in the other case, where the economic motive is just as great, it is not possible at all?

In both cases success of the minority depends upon reaching the public mind. When Adolph Hitler started his political career his following numbered about ten persons, and it would have remained a party of ten persons unless he had been able to appeal successfully to certain passions of the public—mainly the pugnacities, animosities, hates, desires related to nationalism; passions so strong that those who yield to them become oblivious of where they are being led, what they are sacrificing.

The most deeply rooted of all impulses or instincts is, of course, that of self-preservation since without it living things could not have continued to exist. And if we analyse a little objectively the motives which have induced millions in Europe to follow a path which leads to their own destruction, we shall find, despite the apparent paradox, that the first and dominant motive has its roots in self-preservation, defence.

We know that the impulse of self-preservation, obeyed without regard to change of external circumstance, without intelligent recognition of that change, can operate to our destruction. When the passengers of a ship, in case of collision, make a panic rush for the boats, they are obeying an instinct of self-preservation which might have been preservative when it prompted an animal or a herd to take to flight when danger appeared. But panic, disorderly flight in the case of passengers on a ship, will end by destroying them. So in the case of the nations. *Every nation in the world is adopting a method of defence which, when adopted by all, ends by making the defence of any impossible.* What is the essence of that method? Each great power broadly takes the line: If we are to be secure, we must be stronger than any likely to challenge us. It proceeds to make itself thus stronger than a potential rival as the indispensable condition of defence. What becomes, in that case, of the defence of the weaker? If superiority of power is indispensable to defence, the weaker has no defence.

Clearly that method starts with a violation of right and ethics in that the stronger denies to the weaker that right of defence by superior power which the former claims.

When this very elementary ethical truth is pointed out the retort sometimes is that a householder does not deny right when he barricades his house against the burglar; that Britain therefore denies no right when it makes itself impregnable.

But that reply ignores the whole nature of international relationship. "Defence" is not a matter of keeping out foreigners. Britain has not been faced by the problem of repelling foreigners from its soil since the Norman invasion. But the British army has fought in every country of the world, and the Englishman would do well to ask himself why, if defence really means locking the doors against the intruder, he is so often to be found in other peoples'

houses.

In fact, however, it does not mean that war is necessarily aggressive because it happens to be fought on some one else's soil. For defence means the defence of legitimate interests, rights, arising out of such questions as whether trading ships can pass through a particular sea uninterruptedly, whether food can be brought in security from distant lands, traders live in safety, necessary materials obtained, and much else of the same character.

But if defence means the defence of what we believe to be our rights, the claim for superior power as the instrument of such defence puts us in a moral dilemma even worse than that just sketched. The position might be indicated as one in which a great state says to another: "Although we ask for superior power it will never be used except for defence. That is to say, when we get into a dispute with you as to our respective rights and interests, and the question is whether you are right or we are right, what we mean by defence is that we alone shall be judge of that question, and shall always be in a position to impose our judgment." The denial of right in that case becomes more outrageous than ever. The weaker is denied the right of judgment which the stronger claims.

Now if one examines the outstanding facts of the international situation in Europe this last thirty years (or for that matter this last three hundred), one sees that that dilemma lies at the root of the whole trouble. The nations seek to give expression to the instinct of self-preservation in such a way that the preservation, defence of one is secured by depriving another of it. Obviously that must ultimately lead to conflict.

The first impulse of those who realise at all deeply this dilemma is to say that in order to secure peace men must give up the claims for defence, or at least for armed defence. And *if indeed men could be induced to do that, never to possess arms at all, obviously the problem of war would be solved. It is an extremely attractive doctrine, and much more practicable than would appear at first sight;* and nothing but good can come of making the public more familiar with the arguments by which it may be supported. But three main considerations have to be taken into account.

The first is that the new or revived phenomenon of Fascism presents aspects of the problem which were not urgent a quarter of a century ago. If, to put the case concretely, a party pledged to refrain from the use of arms could be returned to power in, say, Great Britain, the first result of an unarmed government would not be a foreign invasion, but the seizure of the government by an armed party within Great Britain itself, a party approximating in its outlook to the armed parties which in so many countries of Europe have seized the reins of government. If that happened what would a government pledged to pacifism do? Would it resist the armed assault upon the constitution? If so, it

would be in a position of being ready to use arms against its own countrymen, but not against foreigners. If it did *not* resist the assault of the armed rebels, then the government would be taken over by that armed group, perhaps representing a quite small minority, who would thereupon imprison all pacifists, teach the children of the nation to love violence, train them in military-mindedness, and hopes of peace by that road would certainly be for a long time deferred.

In order to prevent that outcome the question arises whether the use of force need involve the moral dilemma which has been sketched above. The essence of that dilemma was that if each nation is its own defender, and a strong one is in conflict with a weak one, the weak has no defence, and the stronger becomes the judge of every dispute between them. Organised society within the nation has, however, managed to escape from that dilemma by neutralising the power of the stronger party so that force, violence, does not become the means of determining the merits of the dispute. If having had a quarrel with my neighbour about some money matter, I enter his house in order to take his property, because I believe that I am entitled so to do, my neighbour sends for the policeman, who however *does not settle the dispute*. He knows nothing of the dispute. He merely prevents me from settling it; prevents the use of my violence. Being thus restrained from making myself the judge, and from using my violence to enforce my judgment, I may be willing to turn to third party judgment, law, custom, tradition, to things other than violence. That in civilized society is the real purpose of armed force—to render impossible the use of violence to determine disputes, or, to put it in different terms, to see that force instead of being the instrument of rival litigants in which the superior strength of one party is the final arbiter, becomes the instrument of the law—the law against violence, so that some factor other than violence can be brought into play.

The problem which confronts European civilization is to find the road by which (it may be slowly and bit by bit) force can be transferred from the litigants to the law, the law that there shall be no war.

The theory of the thing is plain enough, simple enough. The difficulty is in its practical application. And yet applied it must be if the present anarchy is not to end in the destruction of all civilization. However difficult the application may be it is certain that it could have been successfully applied on occasions in the past seven or eight years when it has not been applied, *if only public opinion had been more insistent*. It has not been insistent because understanding of the right principle has not been very clear or very profound. Ever since 1931 when Japan began the invasion of China, European opinion has been greatly confused, sometimes rendered impotent, by the failure to distinguish between the problem of restraining violence, of preventing its use to settle a dispute, and the

problem of deciding the merits of a given dispute. Instead of concentrating upon the one supreme purpose of preventing violence, instead of saying, whether it be to Japan or Italy or Germany : " Whatever the rights and wrongs of this dispute our main concern is to see that violence does not settle it, that the more powerful of the two litigants does not become the judge "—instead of saying that in every case the public in Britain and in Europe has been led off to discussion of the merits of that particular dispute which engaged their attention at the time. Thus, in 1931 it was argued that perhaps there was a good deal to be said for the Japanese case, that the Chinese had been provocative, or in the Italian Abyssinian matter that Abyssinians were after all a very savage people ; or that in the case of Spain the government had been guilty of ferocities. All this was really irrelevant to the main issue of European civilization. The real point was that the exercise of violence by the stronger party to the dispute should if possible be prevented by the intervention of the Community of Nations protecting the weaker against the stronger. It is impossible of course to separate the European from the Far Eastern issue. Peace is indivisible. If Britain had been disposed to furnish economic aid to China in her resistance to Japan in 1931, the former would have had the help of the United States. We would have had, therefore, the forces distributed in this way : On the one side Japan and on the other Britain, most of the British Empire, the United States, China, Russia. If it had been clear that these had been ready to stand by the law against violence, even only to the extent of economic, political, and diplomatic assistance, it is extremely questionable whether that law would in fact have been challenged. And if the law had triumphed in that case it would not have been challenged in the later cases of Abyssinia and Spain.

But Britain at that time, instead of showing feeling for the law, showed among many sections of its people a strong feeling for the violator of the law, for Japan ; a large part of the British Press was pro-Japanese, and the lead so given was followed by large sections of English Society.

It is clear from the behaviour of every nation in the world now engaged in re-armament, that it is not prepared to surrender the use of arms for defence. In that case either defence must come by using such arms as do exist, and as long as they exist, for the defence of the law, the law against violence in the way described, or civilization will perish, and we shall drift once more to a Dark Age. If that happens it will be because the instinct of self-preservation has been expressed *unintelligently*, as certain animals, that have become extinct, gave expression to that instinct ; because the animal has overridden the human, because blind instinct has overridden the seeing mind.

NORMAN ANGELL

INDUSTRIALIZATION

VIOLENCE IS ESSENTIAL TO IT

[J. C. Kumarappa, M.A. (Columbia), B.Sc. (Business Administration) (Syracuse), is the author of *Public Finance and Our Poverty*, and practised as an Incorporated Accountant in London and in India. He is a devoted follower of Gandhiji and is the Organizer and Secretary of the All-India Village Industries Association.—EDS.]

As I am penning these lines Europe is uncertain of its morrow. How many will see the dawn of day and how many will wake in eternity if there is a shower of bombs! What are these conditions due to? Is it a mere fulfilment of ancient prophecy or is it a resultant of our actions? Nay, it is more than all these. It is the ceremony attendant on laying the foundations of the future of Europe. "What?" I may be asked, "Is European society based on war?" "No, it is not merely European society, but all industrialized societies need violence for their existence. War is to them what water is to fish."

Time was when individuals like Alexander, Nadir Shah and Napoleon took to arms for personal aggrandisement, for plunder, for revenge, or from ambition; but to-day wars are for economic reasons. Therefore, if we desire to understand the fundamental nature of war in economics, we have to analyse work and methods of work and discover in them the factors that cause war. Man's effort to supply his needs takes the form of work which on analysis reveals a minor component that makes for development and a major component—drudgery—which is needed to get the full benefit out of the minor component. Work is something more than that which is done. It does something to the worker. The reaction of work on man is often the more important part. This function of work is almost always ignored. Any musician, to attain proficiency, has to practise for hours together on his instrument before he can perform for a few minutes on the platform. The practice—drudgery—is more important in developing the musician than the pleasure of performing on the stage.

The individual man, however, wishes to shirk that disciplinary part of work which is the mould for creation and progress and strives to have merely the pleasurable part without the pain. This is but natural. Aristippus, the predecessor of Epicurus, preached so and made a philosophy of pleasure-seeking as the supreme goal of life nearly twenty-five centuries ago.

In all walks of life the tendency of the individual is to take the subjective, short-time view of life. Only his own enjoyment matters, be it at whatever cost to society. The corrective should be supplied by society—in the form of the state, religion, or social organisation—which alone can afford to take an objective, long-time view of things, keeping steadfastly before itself the

progress of society. In the West, in developing organisation for economic production, the individual point of view has been allowed to prevail unhampered by any considerations other than that of selfish gain, with the result that there has been a sustained effort to retain the pleasures for oneself and pass on the incidental pains to others. This pursuit of the unrestrained short-time view which results in the separation of the two components of work causes friction between individuals; and, on a national scale, where an attempt is made to control other nations economically and politically, causes wars. Plato preached that slavery was ordained by Nature and thus the Empires of Greece and Rome salved their conscience, and shifted the unpleasant part of work to slaves and kept the pleasure to themselves. This tradition we find is followed to this day. The modern types of machinery are but instruments mainly intended to concentrate the pleasures in a few hands and shift the pains to the factory workers whose labours consist in endless repetition of a subdivided process of manufacture and are nerve-racking, as they have been deprived of the element which makes for the growth and development of the worker and gives him pleasure. Work that contains this element along with drudgery, may cause muscular strain and physical fatigue but these pass off with rest; but work from which this element which makes for growth and pleasure has been taken away causes nervous disorders and is, therefore, inimical to human progress. The drudgery part of work is needed to give the worker that discipline without which no one can utilise pleasures properly. We notice an instance of this when a wealthy man's son turns into a debauchee. The self-made man while making his money, has, in the process, disciplined himself to husband his own resources but his son has had no such opportunity. *If we wish to see how a nation deprived of the disciplinary and character-building faculty of work will find its pleasures, we need only visit Pompeii where Rome of the days of slavery enjoyed itself, revelling in all manner of vice and licence.*

Large-scale production of standardised goods under centralised control with machinery is generally called industrialising. The chief feature of this system is that while the plant that transforms raw materials into consumable articles is located in some one place, the required raw materials are gathered from the places of their origin and brought together to feed the machinery. When the finished articles are produced these have again to find a market somewhere in the world. Therefore, to produce under this system one has to conquer time and space because the whole economic unit, from the production of raw materials to the consumption of the finished article, covers the whole world. Unless the control of all the contributing factors is obtained so as to ensure a steady supply of raw materials at a speed demanded by the technical requirements of the plant and machinery for production at an "economic speed" and to ensure the disposal of goods so pro-

duced on profitable terms within reasonable time, no nation can be industrialized. Such control can only be secured by resorting to violence.

For instance, if Lancashire has to produce cloth, the mill itself is situated in Lancashire, where no cotton is grown. This mill forms the centre round which the whole world is made to rotate and subserve its purpose. The agricultural college in India investigates the kind of soil in which the type of cotton required by the mill can be grown. The researches of the college are directed towards producing, by cross-breeding and the like, the quality of cotton which will give the best results for the mill. The farmers who may be cultivating food crops have to be induced to shift to cotton growing. When the cotton is grown, transport with favourable rates of freight to the ports has to be provided. At the port, facilities for loading in the form of quays and wharves have to be built. The shipping has to be regulated and safeguarded with naval bases at Singapore and fortresses at Aden and Gibraltar. To man these the army, navy and air force have to be maintained. Such centralised method of production cannot be carried on for one day without the backing of the army, navy and air force. This Lancashire mill is an integral part of a world-wide organisation. It is, therefore, imperative to control the agricultural colleges, the farmers, taxation, the railways, shipping routes, etc. This cannot be done without the political domination of India and the routes that lead to it. This is on the production side. The organisation does not end there.

When the goods have been produced we have to sell them. Again the problems of routes, ports, steamships and political control of peoples have to be faced. Exchange, customs and other financial and political barriers have to be regulated, to provide the necessary facilities. All this can be done only at the point of the bayonet.

Where industries are left in private hands in a competitive society it becomes necessary to reduce the cost of production to the furthest limit. The chief item the manufacturer would like to see reduced is the labour cost which does not affect himself. This is usually the source of industrial strife and violence. Besides, it means a restriction of the amount of purchasing power distributed. As the effective demand has a direct relation to the purchasing power of the community any curtailing of the labour cost destroys demand and causes the phenomenon known as overproduction and brings about ultimately a trade depression in the economic cycle. To set economic organisation going again the producer has to sell abroad in a market controlled politically by the superiority in arms of the producing country.

By its very nature this system is intended to concentrate rather than distribute wealth. When wealth is accumulated above a certain limit it loses its value as a medium of exchange for consumption goods, and the amount, not spendable in the country itself, has to be directed into channels of foreign investment. Such investments have to be protec-

ted and interests guaranteed by brute force.

Because of the distances that lie between the various processes of production, distribution and consumption of goods under this system, money assumes a position of importance out of all proportion to the function it was meant to fulfil as a medium of exchange. Large-scale production of readily consumable goods, which depreciate at a greater rate than the medium of exchange, places the producer distinctly at a disadvantage in any bargain with the financier who holds the comparatively indestructible commodity —purchasing power. This inequality in the bargaining power leads again to class hatred and violence.

This is how centralised production calls for violence at every step. Does the producer who gets the benefit of the services of the army, navy and the air force pay for them? No. If he did his costs would go up tremendously. Then how are these met? By the dumb millions. India pays over fifty crores for direct military expenses. The money comes from remote places, from starving farmers in this country, and not from the mill-owners of Britain who get the benefits. This again is a means resorted to by industrialized countries to make their goods salable. They can only get such political control over other nations by virtue of superior might, depriving other people of the inborn right of freedom.

It makes no difference what form the social, political or financial organisation may take. As long as there is such centralised method of production violence is needed to make it go. Do we not see Russia, Germany, Great Britain, Japan and Italy as comrades in arms? Of these countries, many will be surprised to know that *Russia spends the most on armaments and Germany comes a good second followed closely by Great Britain.* Although these countries have very different political and social organisations yet because of the one common factor of the centralised method of production, they are all in the same boat as far as violence is concerned.

> Were half the power that fills the world with terror,
> Were half the wealth bestowed on camps and courts,
> Given to redeem the human mind from error,
> There were no need of arsenals or forts.

Our analysis, however, need not mean that the use of machinery always leads to violence. Machines are inanimate things which merely reflect the psychology of the inventor. There are two types of machines. Most machines to-day indicate a mind behind, which thinks in terms of throwing the drudgery part of work on others thus exploiting them. They are drudgery producers. Up to now we have produced very few of the second type of machines which are real tools of men, such as will increase the efficiency of the user and make him more productive. These do not call for centralised control to use them. We shall only begin to invent such machines when our minds are occupied, not with schemes of exploitation, but with plans of supplying human needs in the best possible way. A sewing machine,

while increasing the efficiency of the seamstress and lessening her labour, does not pass on the drudgery to any one else.

Is there no place then for industrialization? Within definite limits centralised methods may be necessary. Where public utilities such as supply of power, water and transport and key industries like steel and iron are concerned, production has to be in a centralised way under social control, organised on the principle of service, and not with a view to profit. If we realize that industrialization is a poison we may use it with great reserve. But if we look upon it as the goal to move towards we shall, as the sage predicts, find that instead of binding the whole world by industrialization we have ultimately bound ourselves to the earth. Instead of progressing towards love and peace we shall be reverting to the jungle law of nature red in tooth and claw. Shall we buy industrialization at such cost and degrade ourselves below brute beasts?

Our considerations show that for industrialization we need violence. (1) We need violence to shift the drudgery part of work on to some one else, reserving to ourselves the fruits of labour; (2) we need violence to get the raw material; (3) we need violence to safeguard its transport to the place of manufacture; (4) we need violence to dispose of the finished goods; (5) we need violence to control the economic cycles produced by various factors consequent on large-scale production; (6) we need violence to safeguard investments of accumulated fortunes; (7) we need violence to lay the burden of the cost of armaments on the shoulders of third parties; and (8) we need violence to coerce people to carry out a central plan. *In India, we often hear people talk glibly of industrialization without realising that the first step in a national programme of industrialization should be the building of ammunition factories.* Do we want to repeat in India the doings of Japan in China, or those of Italy in Abyssinia or those of Germany in Czechoslovakia? Or do we stand for peace, non-violence and truth? This is the first question to be answered by us. Centralised production means control over the lives of others so as to make them fall in line with our plans. It means destruction of other people's freedom, destruction of human lives, depriving other nations of their birthright of employment in converting their own raw materials into consumable goods. It means the production of machines of destruction and the employment of millions of persons in the business of wholesale murder. These are essential for industrialization. Is India prepared to accept such terms for the doubtful advantage of having a multitude of material goods?

J. C. KUMARAPPA

RIGHT ECONOMICS FOR WORLD PEACE

[Richard B. Gregg has practised Law in Boston and has worked in the field of labour relations for several years. He has travelled in China and Japan and has lived for three years in India and seen the practicability and the wisdom of Gandhiji's programme. He wrote *Economics of Khaddar* but is better known as the author of *The Power of Non-Violence*. He is a true realist. The kind of realism expressed in this article is not the non-moral and character-weakening realism of Mr. Neville Chamberlain. Young Indians who are enamoured of Socialism will do well to reflect upon Mr. Gregg's view as to why Socialism would be inoperative and is bound to fail in the course of time.—EDS.]

All through the ages war has been caused by some form of desire for power, greed, pride, intolerance, fear, or anger. In operation these create injustice, resentment, desire for revenge, and violence. These actions and reactions go on endlessly. Economic conditions often are a large factor in all of these processes. Hence, right economic conditions would greatly conduce to world peace.

The present system of mill and factory industry makes children for their first twelve to sixteen years a heavy economic burden on the parents in all ranks of society, and the speed and pressure of work throws most of the workers on the scrap-heap at the age of forty. The crowded living conditions of city slums which accompany factory industry are a hell for mothers and are productive of much disease, crime and moral and social degeneracy of many sorts. The money price control of markets together with over-investment of savings in equipment for production creates alternate periods of glut and economic depression. These factors together with modern automatic machinery cause permanent unemployment among about one-tenth of the population of the industrialized countries and a still larger part of the population to be on government doles in wretchedly low conditions of living and in circumstances degrading to self-respect. Insecurity is everywhere. The drab monotony, unhealthiness, and discontent created by all this make men bitter and eager for the excitement and relatively self-respecting conditions of war. The after-effects of war are further depression and social disruption. An economic system exists presumably for the benefit of the people who live within it, but our present economic system is morally, economically and biologically suicidal.

In order to secure right economics for world peace we need, I believe, to

1. Produce enough food, clothing, housing and other physical, intellectual and emotional satisfactions to give all men, women and children a decent standard of living ;
2. Distribute these goods among all races, nations, classes and communities so as to make this decent standard of living for all a reality ;
3. End unemployment ;

4. Arrange the work of production, distribution and consumption so that it will be socially satisfying to all engaged in it.

The first of these requirements has been convincingly demonstrated to be possible by means of modern technology in agriculture and industry. Though technically this problem has been solved, the solution is not allowed to become effective in the realm of production because of monopolies and financial and political restrictions.

The physical problem of distribution is also equally solvable by means of modern transport and communication. The human factors which prevent just distribution are chiefly greed, desire for power, fear, hate and prejudice, together with defects of organization and defects of our money system. These human factors find their expression in all sorts of tariffs, financial restrictions, monopolies, political and economic barriers.

The methods of progress in these two great problems of production and distribution seem to me to lie along the lines of (a) taxation of the entire ground rent of all land, as proposed by Henry George, so as to abolish land monopoly and holding land idle for purposes of speculation ; (b) alteration of our system of money symbols and medium of exchange so that it will not be so inevitable and effective a stimulus to greed and so thorough a destroyer of all values other than pecuniary. This can be done, I believe, by splitting up the five different functions which money now performs, and having a separate kind of money for each function, with provision for transformation of one kind into another. That is, there would be one kind of money acting only as a medium of exchange, another acting only as a measure of value, another only as a storage of value, another only as a symbol of credit, another only as a means of transferring value from place to place.[1] This change would, I believe, vastly reduce financial restrictions on production and distribution. (c) A third remedy is a lowering of those tariffs which create unfair production and distribution among nations, such unfairness to be measured not by money profits but by the comparative welfare of peoples. (d) A fourth remedy is the spread of consumers' co-operatives of all sorts. (e) Finally, to bring about the foregoing reforms, campaigns of disciplined non-violent persuasion and, if need be, non-violent resistance by exploited nations, classes and communities.

Of these five reforms three would have to be made by the government and would require a decade or more of intense agitation to bring about, but the other two can be initiated by individuals and small groups anywhere and can make great progress in four or five years.

Perhaps I should explain that the principal reason why I do not advocate Socialism is because I cannot see how it can operate without raising a very highly centralized, large

[1]See two articles of mine entitled "What Is the Matter with Money" (*The Modern Review*, May and June, 1938.)

and strong bureaucracy, with greater power than that wielded by the present ruling class in any non-totalitarian nation. I agree with Lord Acton that the exercise of power corrupts him who wields it, and absolute power corrupts absolutely. The decay of all bonds other than the political may bring Socialism in some form in most countries, but I do not think complete Socialism will bring freedom of any kind, or permanent justice or security, or a solution of our economic and political problems.

The complete evil of unemployment and its importance to modern society needs no comment. But the fourth problem I mentioned—that of making all work socially satisfying—is not yet widely realized. Within the last decade there has been a very careful five-year study of the effects caused by taking two small groups of certain employees of the Great Western Electric Company, of Chicago, putting each group in a room of its own, then establishing among them certain working conditions, such as improved lighting and ventilation, lunches together, certain wage payment methods, and so forth, maintaining each condition for a period of about ten weeks and observing results on morale and production. It was proved beyond possibility of doubt that improvement of the social aspects of the work counted more than anything else to increase production and create steady happiness and high morale among the workers. Having a permanent group with opportunities for conversation during the work and eating lunches together created a deep, strong and enduring satisfaction. There is clear evidence that a great deal of the discontent, bitterness, and breakdown of social standards and social bonds among the working populations of all industrialized countries is due to the utter disregard by industrial leaders of the necessity for a strong social context to all work. Man is primarily a social being and if for the majority of every working day he is not allowed spontaneously and fairly freely to exercise his social faculties, he as an individual, and society as a whole decay.[1]

I think it probable that the leaders of industry and finance in all countries are so enmeshed in the faulty set of social, industrial and financial concepts and symbols that they are not able to extricate themselves and make adequate reforms. I think the reforms must come by non-violent efforts of those who are either materially or intellectually and spiritually alienated and dispossessed by the existing socio-economic system.

To end unemployment and to build up social satisfaction in work I see no reform so hopeful as the revival of handicraft work of all kinds carried on mainly in small groups among the unemployed and the intellectually or spiritually alienated. This is not as a substitute for machine industry but to supplement it where it has failed, and gradually by example to correct some of its defects. Of special im-

[1] See *Human Problems of an Industrial Civilization* by Elton Mayo, 1933; and *Leadership in a Free Society* by T. N. Whitehead, 1937.

portance are hand-spinning and hand-weaving, because the product is a necessity, the spinning tools can easily be transported and brought to group meetings, the work is easily learned, can be done by all ages and kinds of people at all seasons and at almost any time of the day. This is, of course, Mahatma Gandhi's proposal.

To those who protest that to take to handicrafts means the abandonment of that immensely fruitful industrial principle of division of labour, I would answer that the invention of automatic machinery has already caused the discard of that principle over wide industrial areas, and that discard is steadily and rapidly proceeding. Nor does this proposal mean for society the abandonment of machinery. But to those whom machine industrialism under financial control has robbed of self-respect, work, satisfaction in work, and a happy and stable social life, the exercise of handicrafts in groups will restore that which was taken away, will provide endurable standards of living, will give poise and significance to life. It will build democracy and help to heal the existing dangerous crevasses in society.

International conflicts are a summation and expression of social conflicts within the nations. These domestic social conflicts will largely disappear as soon as right economic conditions are created and maintained.

RICHARD B. GREGG

Never in this world can hatred be stilled by hatred ; it will be stilled only by non-hatred—this is the Law Eternal.

Some quarrellers do not realise that in this world we must all at some time cease to live ; but there are others who do so realise, and they will settle their quarrels.

—Dhammapada

RACE PREJUDICE AND WAR

[Lord Olivier has first-hand knowledge of the problem on which he is writing; he has been in official capacity to British Honduras, Leeward Islands, Jamaica, and has had opportunities to study it in various state secretariats in the capital of the British Commonwealth. He was Secretary of State for India in 1924. He is the author of *White Capital and Coloured Labour, The Anatomy of African Misery, The Empire Builder* and other volumes. His article should be read in conjunction with the two which follow.—EDS.]

Socrates, in his last discourse to his friends, as related by Plato (*Phædo*, Section 30), uttered (almost casually, it might seem, for it was not relevant to his argument), the very pregnant and modernly applicable observation: "For all wars amongst us arise on account of our desire to acquire wealth."

So far as inter-racial hostility or colour prejudice exist in the modern world, that generalisation is eminently true about that form of "war". The original causes are principally economic, arising out of the desire of a conquering or mastering people to enslave or employ on cheap terms a weaker or conquered race, or to possess the latter's women, and guard their own from intercourse with the slave race.

The social institution of slavery itself produces, by reaction, a doctrine of superiority on the part of the dominant race, and of inferiority attributable to the subordinate. Plato's disciple, Aristotle, sanctioned this prejudice in the Greek community by the theory that "the barbarian races" were slavish by nature.

Modern South African racial philosophy goes even further than this, and professes to consider the native African unfitted for civic association with white men. On the basis of this theory, native African races, not only in South Africa, but further north, are being subjected to what is described as a "segregation" policy, meaning that they are to live in special areas, have no civic rights in the states to which they belong, and are only to mix and associate with white men in the relation of labourers under contracts of service. The basis of this policy, as Professor W. A. Macmillan, in his recent volume, *Africa Emergent*, once more uncompromisingly demonstrates, is impossible and self-contradictory, (since the blacks must mix with, and reside among, the whites in order to work for them), and is admitted by South African politicians to be nothing else than fear.

In industrial relations hostility is aroused among the white wage-workers against the black by the fear of their competition at the very low rates of wages at which they can be forced to work, combination among them being forbidden, and all attempts at organising such combination being declared by law seditious and subject to heavy penalties. Not only are these relations essentially of the character of civil war, arising out of "desire

to acquire wealth", but they are actively provocative of inter-racial hatred and prejudice, which are becoming in all such mixed societies rapidly and markedly more acute as education progresses among the subject people, and as the poverty of the unskilled white workers, both in Africa and in the United States, who have to compete with them as wage-workers or share-croppers grows more prevalent. Mr. Macmillan, in the volume I have named, thus describes the results in South Africa (where colour bar legislation expressly excludes coloured people from employment in skilled mechanical industries) :—

In South Africa, the oldest and much the strongest of the settler countries, the state of society has now become intolerable or even dangerous and sets men groping for a more satisfactory solution. While only an astonishing resilience characteristic of Africa saves the spirit of the native Africans, whose tribal organisation, such as it was, is shattered, the less successful Europeans—the poor whites—now find themselves in cut-throat competition for unskilled employment with a growing host of landless blacks still poorer than themselves. These "poor whites", though like any similar community they are suspicious of "capitalism", have in addition come to regard the rise of the Africans to competence as a formidable peril to their own interests or privileges.

So long as the deposits of mineral wealth, which have attracted capitalist investment to Africa, remain unexhausted, or can, under the shield of a colour bar, continue to yield profit only to Europeans, the actual warfare implicit in these conditions may not become violently manifest : but in a society dependent solely on agriculture it is not possible for both an indigenous and an immigrant population to earn a high standard of livelihood ; and where native Africans have been excluded from their accustomed means of subsistence, whilst their numbers increase and their requirements for an advancing standard of civilisation are continually being stimulated by contacts with European society, *it is impossible to expect that there will not, in the course of at most two generations from now, be positive manifestations of revolt against racial repression, and that the now implicit warfare will become explicit,* as it has done everywhere else under similar conditions throughout the course of history.

Mr. Peter Nielsen, lately retired from many years' public service as a magistrate in South Africa, has embodied in his book, recently published, *The Colour Bar,* his personal judgments on the origins of colour prejudice, in which, after discussing various popular theories as to its justification, he makes the following rather remarkable statement :—

The fact remains that the general fear in the Whites is not now of the enmity of the African but of his friendliness, seeing that it is recognised by all that as an open enemy he can be kept in subjugation but that as a close friend and neighbour his claim to full equality with his present masters may soon prove irresistible.

Fear, then, of our black fellow man as a competitor and rival, if not as a potential enemy, we see to be the continuing cause of the whole situation which has come to be recognised as the Native Problem. But fear of our fellow men we have been taught to suspect as a wrong motive for any kind

of collective action against them, a sinful feeling to be cast out and replaced by perfect love.

"In time", observes Shakespeare, "we hate that which we often fear."

It is now hardly disputed by any one who has lived in a mixed society, that there is not any natural antipathy between persons of different races who mix in conditions in which there is no opposition of interests. Religious and educational teachers and young children habitually find them attractively lovable. Even the time-honoured theory that Africans and some other coloured races had an unpleasant bodily smell (which is untrue, whenever they spend, as they love to do, much time and money on washing and soap) can hardly appear a convincing reason for segregation of those races themselves, in view of the profuse advertisement which now fills all our newspapers, of similar liability to offensive effluvia attaching to graceful young English women. Moreover, it has long been notorious that Africans and Indians find the odour of white men quite sickening. When Mr. Bernard Shaw returned recently from a tour round the world, he expressed to me his sense of the extreme attractiveness of the Cingalese people, who, he said, appeared to him to be manifestly the most successful human bodily type (as it is probably one of the earliest) produced by the Life Force in the form of humanity, not only by reason of physical grace and charm, but by natural good humour, courtesy, and quickness of sympathy and intelligence. Nevertheless, these same people have, within memory, been embroiled in bloody conflicts with the representatives of white civilisation, who came to Ceylon for the purpose of making profits out of their labour.

Mr. Nielsen, however, in summing up his conclusions, attributes race prejudice and fear in South Africa far more to the consolidation of a belief in race as the basis of nationalism, than to the influence of economic jealousy. He observes :—

> At the present time the numbers of those who profess belief in the need for perpetual hostility are greater, and the noise of their preachment is louder than ever before. Millions of white people are being exhorted to worship only the folk-soul, the dynamic principle behind all progress ; to cast away the outmoded ideological lumber of the past and to learn to think only with their blood when they think about the purpose of their own collective being.

He quotes the memorable pronouncement of Sir Thomas Watt, one of the members of the Legislature for Natal :—

> The White Man is determined to do all he can to remain and, what is more, to rule. This matter is to us in South Africa such a vital and fundamental matter that no ethical considerations such as the rights of man, will be allowed to stand in the way.

This may be taken as a typical utterance of the feeling of the electorate in the Dominion of South Africa, and in the Rhodesias, from which electorate natives are, or are being, regrettably excluded or reduced, at best, to a negligible minority.

Sir John Harris, Secretary of the

Anti-Slavery and Aborigines Protection Society, since his recent return from a visit to most of the mixed communities in South Africa, has frequently expressed himself as appalled at the marked intensification and rapid progress of inter-racial hostility since the date of his last previous visit, and he very appropriately quotes, in his pamphlet *South Africa from the Cape to the Zambesi,* (published by his Society, price 3*d*.,) a memorable utterance made by General Smuts in 1926 :

At that time the Government of South Africa was embarking upon its first definite colour bar legislation debarring British subjects of any colour —and solely because of their colour— from attaining to any form of industrial or civic citizenship. General Smuts then warned South Africa of the danger ; he said : " The bill will be taken as an outrage not only by Black Africa but by Yellow Asia".... " We shall gather on our heads the hatred of the whole of Asia."..." We, a handful of whites, are ring-fencing ourselves first with an inner ring of black hatred and beyond that with a ring of hatred of the whole of Asia."..." The natives are seething with discontent all over South Africa."..... " In these circumstances the Colour Bar Bill gratuitously produced here is a firebrand flung into a haystack."

Are we of this generation to witness the fulfilment of this prophecy ? That is the question which leaped forward in every discussion from the Cape to Buluwayo, from Bechuanaland to Zululand, no matter with whom the discussion took place—Government officials, traders, planters, chiefs, native councils, natives on the highways, on farms, or in the locations and reserves. The answer to the question is " Not just yet ", because though the African is an ardent lover he is a slow hater. But what is admitted to be true is that suspicions and discontent have increased disastrously since General Smuts's prophecy and who can be surprised ?

OLIVIER

[The above article gives the angle of vision of a sympathetic Englishman on the subject of racial prejudice which is gathering force and which is bound to generate war.

The two which follow are by ' coloured ' gentlemen who examine the problem of the relation between the two races on two continents.—EDS.]

PEACE BETWEEN THE WHITE AND THE BLACK RACES

[In the first article the consideration of the problem of colour conflict is localized. It is pointed out that race prejudice in the Southern States of the U.S.A. inhibits the progress of these States. The *status quo* existing there at present is described as an "ingrowing imperialism based on colour caste". But a note of optimism is struck. It is thought that general tendencies are such that revolution may be averted and a progressive movement eventuate "if the common interests of the common man—black and white—become the pivot of reform effort".

The second one surveys the position of the Dark Races in the international world and declares that the racial problem is rooted in economic soil. But this is only partially true. Race prejudice flourishes equally among black and white people whose income is the same and whose social status is similar. It is in evidence between capitalist and capitalist, as between labourer and labourer—witness the writer's own statement regarding the treatment meted out by many unions of the American Federation of Labour.

But viewing both these articles, one feels that however ameliorating reforms may be, the evil of colour prejudice cannot be wiped out unless men begin to realize their spiritual identity and solidarity. Selfishness and the sin of separateness are the roots of all human misery, and, as H. P. Blavatsky points out, "the only palliative to the evils of life is union and harmony—a Brotherhood in ACTU, and *altruism* not simply in name".—EDS.]

I.—THE NEGROES OF THE U.S.A.

[**Alain Locke** is Professor of Philosophy at Howard University, Washington D. C. He studied at Oxford as a Rhodes Scholar, is a Ph. D. of Harvard, and is the author of several books on the Negro question, *e. g.*, *The Negro in America* and *Frederick Douglass, A Biography of Anti-Slavery*.—EDS.]

Certainly the only peace an intelligent and loyal Negro can contemplate in the situation of racial inequality and conflict in the Southern United States is a peace with justice, which in the long or short run must involve a radical revision of the *status quo*. It would seem that also any far-sighted patriot or liberal cosmopolitan would be in complete agreement with this principle, not only from the idealistic point of view of justice and consistency with professed democratic principles, but also from the pragmatic position that in no other way can the increasing demands of the aggrieved minority be settled. In the so-called Black Belt, which includes about sixty per cent of the Southern area, the Negro population is a numerical minority by only a small margin, and in certain specific areas it really forms a majority in numbers though not in economic resources or in political power. The one thing to be agreed upon by all schools of thought on the subject is, therefore, that a solution within the *staus quo* is out of the question. For that *status quo* rests upon political dis-

ranchisement, economic exploitation, arbitrarily and legally defined bi-racial life in separate schools, eparate public conveyances, separate churches and separate institutional organizations of other ypes, with a social stigma of "inferiority" to bolster the social olicy of "white supremacy". To bservers not familiar with the situation in detail it might be graphically described as an internal colonial status, an ingrowing mperialism based on colour caste.

What then can we mean by alking of peace, if we go beyond nere pious aspirations and unrealistic hopes? I think the first realization of any practical importance s the reckoning, unusual in the framework of traditional race prejudice, that the white man and his civilization suffer greatly from the repression of the black minority. If, as is coming to be increasingly recognized, the low standard of living, the economic backwardness of the South and the retardation of general social progress in this region are direct results and general consequences of Southern social, economic and political policies based largely on the racial situation, then the motives and the reasons for social reconstruction become the common interest and involve the common welfare of white and black alike. Against the partisan traditions of generations, this realization is rapidly coming to the fore in the progressive thinking of the South. It is still a minority opinion, but there is no doubt that it holds the one hope for the future that might possibly avert race conflict of serious proportions in the next generation or half-generation. When President Roosevelt characterized the South, as he recently did, as "the Nation's No. 1 economic problem", he was proposing in a statesmanlike way a common denominator for social reconstruction. The earlier so-called "Reconstruction", after the emancipation of the slaves, brought neither real social reform nor social peace. It was pivoted on racial factionalism, national sectionalism with hatreds and prejudices between the North and the South resulting from the alignment of the Civil War, and the reconciliation of these factions since 1900 in the new industrialization of the South was entirely at the expense of the Negro's interests and the political and economic rights of both the Negroes and the poor whites. They eventually found themselves jointly involved in a wage slavery as unskilled mill and factory labour or in an agrarian serfdom as tenant farmers or share-croppers.

The contemporary share-cropper's revolt in the Southern Tenant Farmers' Union, the trends toward labour organization of the semi-skilled and unskilled workers, who include many Negroes and the potentialities of political realignment breaking the Democratic Party's old-line closed primary election, which was the chief mechanism of Negro disfranchisement,—these all point to issues of crucial and perhaps revolutionary reform. But as involving a new division between progressives and conservatives rather than one on purely race lines they forecast a lessening of the tension

along racial lines and the possible averting of mass race conflict. Struggle there will be in either case, but if the common interests of the common man, black and white, become the pivot of reform effort, a progressive rather than a revolutionary movement can be anticipated. In many instances, notably in the organization of black and white workers together, especially in the farmer-tenant unions, this solvent of common interest has proved effective to overcome the traditional prejudice of race.

In another country an analysis of this sort would really mean just a forecast of class war taking the place of race war. But in America economic reconstruction is already far enough advanced and has sufficient mass momentum to warrant our thinking of its extension without the necessity of revolution. If the cause of the Negro masses can be hitched to this forward social movement there is hope. The younger Negro leadership, aware of this, is striving to harness the rising race consciousness and the growing solidarity of the Negro group to such an alignment rather than to the normally separatist trends of "self-determination" and a policy of political and economic separatism. The barriers of prejudice cause many eddies of purely racial feeling, but the larger vision of the more intelligent sections of Negro opinion is for common action and progressivism, particularly on the political and economic fronts. Culturally the major trends are still racialist and probably will remain so in this relatively non-controversial field.

The contemporary Western world is to-day one of unpredictable potentialities. Certainly the tendencies of minority causes generally do not favour the prediction of a peaceful solution of the American race problem. But the complete cultural assimilation of the Negro in American life and his lack of political ambitions beyond common citizenship rights in the traditional framework of the American democracy do argue for the possibility at least, with proper social and economic reform, of that peace with justice of which we spoke at the outset. One thing is certain, under the structure of American life no large-scale improvement of the economic lot of the common man is possible without proportional inclusion of the mass Negro. A wide differential of living standards or of wage standards, even as wide as the present discrepancies, will thwart the general progress and jeopardize basic reforms now under way, such as state responsibility for unemployment, social security, child-labour reforms, wide-scale unionization of labour, public supervision of health and the like, to which the public policy in America is already seriously committed. We used to say that Christianity and democracy were both at stake in the equitable solution of the race question. They were, but they were abstract ideals that did not bleed when injured. Now we think, with more realistic logic perhaps, that economic justice cannot stand on one foot; and economic reconstruction is the domin

ant demand in the present-day American scene.

In it lies the hope both for progress and for peace in this generations-old problem of race relations.

ALAIN LOCKE

II.—IN DARK AFRICA

[William Harrison is an Afro-American who would be called a patriot by the Africander and a coloured man by the American. He won scholarships and prizes at Harvard and has already made his mark as a journalist. He is Editor of *International African Opinion*.—EDS.]

At the outbreak of the Italo-Ethiopian war in 1935, General Smuts and Premier Hertzog of the Union of South Africa predicted that a wave of resentment would sweep the continent of Africa if the League of Nations did not aid the last independent nation governed by an African potentate. As these statesmen realised, the Emperor Haile Selassie was a symbol of African hopes and aspirations, a figure in whom the Africans and peoples of African descent took great pride. Indeed, their prediction has come true, and the wave of resentment has not yet subsided, though the prestige of the European has waned considerably. It is no exaggeration to say that confidence has been lost, that the implicit trust which the simple-minded natives were wont to place in the words of Governments has suffered a severe shock ; perhaps the damage to European prestige is still not so evident on the surface, largely because the channels of African opinion are far from wide. Except for articulation on the West Coast—Sierra Leone, the Gold Coast and Nigeria—African opinion is mute, prevented from full expression by political and social factors. Some African languages, for example, have not been reduced to writing ; the development of interior regions has not reached the stage where rapid communications between distant parts can be taken as a matter of course ; the so-called "jungle-telegraph"—the signals which reverberate across wide stretches of territory through the rhythmic beating of drums—is an avenue of African native publicity not accessible to peoples of different culture and location.

When one considers all the difficulties in the way of an approach to any understanding of the real opinions held by masses of Africans and peoples of African descent, one hesitates to declare what their prevalent feeling of black and white relations is. If we consider the least retarded section, the 16,000,000 Negroes of the United States, it is possible to forecast the spiritual climate in some degree. We should remember, even in that instance, that although there have long been organisations such as the National Association for the Advancement of Coloured People, founded in 1911 as an aftermath of the race riots in Atlanta, Georgia, and the Equal Rights League, headed by the late William Monroe Trotter in its heyday, nevertheless the

political consciousness of the American Negro did not become international, and he did not acquire any feeling of solidarity with his African brethren until the post-War appearance of Marcus Garvey, with his strongly nationalistic "Back-to-Africa" movement. The Garvey movement mobilised the masses of American Negroes to a degree comparable to the mobilisation of India's teeming millions by Mahatma Gandhi, but as Garvey is not a great man like Gandhi, his programme has remained wholly visionary, with few concrete results. Almost the only important result of Garveyism has been the creation of Negro solidarity, but the leader gave it no practical direction. He stood firmly, however, against European imperialism in Africa, but envisaged the solution of the African problem through the lens of a scheme for repatriation, as I have said, for the American Negroes, who were to return *en masse*. How ill-considered his policy was appeared when the Liberian Government refused to allow Garveyite emigrants to land in their country—Garvey had evidently neglected to sound them out in advance. Trotter, who as a Negro leader is not so widely known as Garvey, was chiefly concerned with the struggle against the civil and political disabilities of American Negroes, inveighing against evils like racial segregation: otherwise his programme was not nationalistic in any sense, as he stood for the assimilation and integration of the American Negro into American political and social life. He felt that the assimilative process could be achieved by the enforcement of existing Constitutional guarantees. Like Dr. W. E. B. Du Bois,[1] the militant editor of the organ of the National Association for the Advancement of Coloured People, he consumed much of his energy in fighting for the eradication of evils like lynching, through legislation enacted by the Federal Government; but he did not attack the fundamental assumptions upon which the American Republic rests. Trotter's only instance of international spirit appeared when in 1919 he endeavoured to place the problems of the American Negroes as an oppressed minority before the Peace Conference at Versailles, but as he was ignored, that gesture may be taken as rather an instinctive realisation that the problems of all Africans and peoples of African descent are inextricably interwoven.

It is safe to say that all the Negro organisations of any scope, including even the Pan-African Congress established by Dr. W. E. B. Du Bois, had protest as almost their ultimate aim, and they approached the economic problem as secondary.

As early as 1915, Dr. Du Bois had sensed the growing importance of Labour in world politics, and had declared that the only lasting solution of the American race problem was unity between the white and black workers, but the realities of the trades-union movement in the United States, the exclusion of Negroes from many

[1] See his articles in THE ARYAN PATH for March 1936 on "The Clash of Colour" and for October 1936 on "The Union of Colour".—EDS.

unions of the American Federation of Labour during the regime of Samuel Gompers, led him to emphasise the purely *racial* difficulties of Negroes even in the ranks of organised Labour. His project of the Pan-African Congress, which was chiefly a conference of intellectuals irregularly convened and unsystematic in its methods of organisation, was designed to further spiritual solidarity amongst all Africans and peoples of African descent in the United States, the West Indies, South America and Africa. He felt even a certain kinship with the Indians, Chinese and Japanese. It is significant that the sub-title of *The Crisis*, his magazine, was "A Record of the Darker Races".

Real challenge to the programmes of Negro organisations did not come for some time. Various inter-racial associations have been and are in vogue; the president of the National Association for the Advancement of Coloured People has always been a white man, and the principal financial support has been rendered by white persons. All the local branches, except in the Southern States of the American Union, contain white officers as well as black, since membership is open to anybody who is desirous of improving the condition of the Negro and thus removing the causes of racial friction. Since the advent of the Italian conquest of Ethiopia, however, the masses of American Negroes have been smitten with a race-consciousness that is deeper than that inculcated by Garveyism. They have been influenced by the wave of resentment which has swept the coloured world. Coming as it did in the midst of the world-depression, when their economic lot has worsened, the Ethiopian affair gripped the imagination of the Negroes. The ground had already been prepared by the Communist Party of the United States, the American section of the Communist International, which began to be active shortly after the War, making it a cardinal point in their policy to stress Negro grievances. Though recruitment into the ranks has been and is comparatively small, the growth has not been so—by that statement I mean that the figures published by the Communists themselves tend to show a steady increase from year to year. With their slogan of "Self-determination for the Negro people in the Black Belt" they shook the basic assumptions of previous Negro thought, for they held that the Negroes in the South, where the greater proportion resides anyway, constituted a real nation, an oppressed national minority similar to the Georgians or Poles under the Tsarist regime. Now is not the time and here is not the place to discuss this highly controversial and arguable thesis, but confirmation of a latent nationalist spirit has come with the establishment of the National Negro Congress in 1935. It would be chronologically incorrect to assert that the founding of the Congress was inspired by the events in Ethiopia, as the first sessions met in February 1935 before knowledge of the Italo-Ethiopian conflict was widespread amongst the general public. *What is significant, however, is the phenom-*

enal growth of the Congress after that date, and its long-term tendency to increase. Other organisations, to be sure, sprang up as a direct result of the pro-Ethiopian feeling amongst the Negroes. Many have since declined in influence as well as numbers, but the chief was the American Aid to Ethiopia (now disintegrated), an inter-racial group whose purpose was the purchase of medical supplies for Ethiopia. Another is the United Aid for Peoples of African Descent, whose membership and influence are largely confined within Harlem, the Negro quarter of New York, while the sending of a special emissary to the American people by Haile Selassie, after his exile, resulted in the formation of the Ethiopian World Federation.

I have instanced all the American Negro organisations of explicit or implicit political purpose to indicate the extent of activity amongst the race in America. This activity in turn shows their consciousness of their problems in both the national and international aspects. But this means of gauging their opinion can be supplemented by the perusal of their principal newspapers such as *The Pittsburgh Courier, The Baltimore Afro-American, The Boston Guardian, The New York Amsterdam News, The Chicago Defender,* and *The Norfolk Journal and Guide.* It is possible also, of course, to cite representative Negro writers and men of affairs, like Dr. Du Bois, Langston Hughes, James W. Ford, Claude McKay, George S. Schuyler, Paul Robeson, Kelly Miller,[1] and J. A. Rogers, belonging to both the conservative and radical political camps. In all these newspapers and books, which are the voice of the Negro, to use a hackneyed expression, the will to peace is manifest. Their "inarticulate major premiss" is that at bottom the interests of the whites and the blacks in America are the same, and no lasting peace can be established without social, economic and political equality.

In so far as the International African Service Bureau of London, headed by George Padmore, internationally the most prominent Negro political writer, is representative of native African opinion, it challenges the basic assumptions of world-society, being explicitly anti-imperialist and dedicated, like the Universal Negro Improvement Association of Garvey, to the policy of Africa for the Africans, and its policy has an orientation to the Marxist left, although it is not an affiliate of either the Communist, or the Second, or the Fourth (Trotskyist) International, but endeavours to adapt Marxism to the purposes of Africans, whom it regards as for the most part peasants rather than proletarians. As agriculture is the economic basis of most African communities, whether on the Gold Coast or in Tanganyika, the analysis of Padmore and his colleagues seems realistic. In fact, their economic analysis is correct also for the British West Indies and the Southern States of the American Union. Hence, the land problem,

[1] See his article "Race and Culture" in THE ARYAN PATH for December 1930.—EDS.

wherever Africans and peoples of African descent are, is of capital importance, since the majority of them can be found either directly engaged in agricultural labour or dependent upon the fruits of agriculture for their livelihood. In West Africa, this fact is classically illustrated by the dependence of entire communities upon the success or failure of a single crop, the cocoa crop, and when world prices for cocoa are low, an acute depression sets in; this depression halts the entire economic activity of the territories such as the Gold Coast, Sierra Leone, and Nigeria. Likewise, in the West Indies wherever the system of single crops prevails, the loss of markets, because of competition from other countries which raise the same crop, causes economic depression leading to unemployment. Once unemployment becomes widespread, political disturbances occur, as in Jamaica, Trinidad, and British Guiana this year, and political questions affecting the peoples of African descent begin to assume a gravity which previously they did not possess. Owing to the economic status of the whites as exploiters of the resources and labour of the colonies, they soon receive the focus of attention, and the spirit of inter-racial friction arises from its always dormant state to violent activity.

In the face of these problems of race which have their origin not in any malice aforethought, as the lawyers say, on the part of either the white or the black race, but in the economic system under which they both live, it is easy to see that final peace between them can come only by abolition of the system and through the establishment of a new economic order which will change their social relations from that of exploiter *vis-à-vis* exploited, privileged versus underprivileged, master against serf. Fortunately for both of them, despite the upheavals of the present and even a certain amount of social chaos that is manifest in undeclared wars of aggression, the tendency of our age is towards the achievement of that "Parliament of man, the federation of the world", which was envisioned by Tennyson. Time is on the side of peace.

WILLIAM HARRISON

PEACE BETWEEN JEWS AND GENTILES

[Cecil Roth writes to us: "I am a simple historian, who in consequence of the general misunderstanding of what his own people, the Jews, stand for has withdrawn himself to an increasing extent from general and concentrated himself on Jewish research. And I am one of those who feel that, whereas research (which is the pursuit of truth) was once a self-understood academic pastime it has now become—because it is the pursuit of truth—a bulwark of a threatened civilization. I don't know whether it is of interest that I have just resigned my Corresponding Membership of various Italian academies in consequence of Mussolini's latest anti-Semitic legislation, which clearly does more violence to Italy's tradition than to the rights of Italian Jewry."

Mr. Roth contributed a very reasoned article on "The Nazi Delusion" to our issue of October 1934.—EDS.]

It is seldom that I have found such difficulty in writing an article as in the case of the present one, which I have been asked to contribute to THE ARYAN PATH on "Peace between Jews and Gentiles". I have begun time after time, but the result has each time been hopelessly unsatisfactory: I have come back after a day or two, but with no more success than before. The reason did not lie in the atmosphere of turmoil which was omnipresent in those fate-fraught days at the close of September. Never perhaps was the desire for peace so articulate and so omnipresent in the world as it was at that period: though it was a feeling based more on physical than on idealistic considerations, more on fear than on love, more on a prejudice against being killed than on one against killing. The difficulty that I felt was not an external, but rather an internal one. The subject I had been assigned was one that I found hard to expound—not because the ideal is impossible, but because it is self-evident. It is as difficult for me to think of anything but peace between Jew and Gentile as it is for me to think of anything but affection between brother and brother. True—as between brother and brother—there may be occasional misunderstandings and ill-feeling. But it would clearly be improper to regard such interludes as the natural state, and the normal feeling of amity as a comparatively remote ideal.

In the same manner, the idea of reciprocal enmity between Jew and Gentile is completely alien to the Jew (at least). Hence he is unable to consider its antithesis, interdenominational Peace, as anything but a perfectly natural state, which it is as difficult to theorise about as is our necessity for air to breathe or food to eat. Mankind is, one hopes, approaching the day (though, alas, there is no present indication of the fact) when international peace will be considered no less fundamental and self-evident. Yet there is a difference. For the ideal of International Peace has in the past been known only sporadically. Enmity between Jew and Gentile, on the other hand, has behind it no historic tradition, and Peace between Jew and Gentile is only the perpetuation of the con-

dition which has long existed in the world of ideals.

This may seem a curious statement, in view of the long history of Anti-Semitism and of the present recrudescence of religious persecution in its most hideous form. But enmity presupposes a reciprocal feeling: and however much Jews may have been persecuted in the past, they have reciprocated only with resentment, protest, fear—never with hatred. And there is a good reason for this. For, however it may be rationalised and endowed with a modern scientific terminology, Anti-Semitism is at root, and in origin, based on religious motives. A faith like mediæval Christianity which considered itself to be possessed of the sole secret of righteous living and eternal felicity, must necessarily look forward to convincing those who thought otherwise, either by persuasion or by compulsion. Hence, in the last instance, the mediæval persecutions, the mediæval massacres, the beginnings of Anti-Semitism. Now, it is one of the greatest glories of Judaism that it has never fostered this narrow view. The righteous of all peoples and creeds, according to Rabbinic teaching, are assured of a place in the world to come : while any man who leads a righteous life and believes in the Divine unity may be accounted as a Jew.

To claim that this tolerant ideal was always lived up to is perhaps excessive—circumstances, and the influences of environment, sometimes proved too strong. Nevertheless, whereas among most Western creeds tolerant practice gradually outstripped intolerant theory only in the course of the nineteenth century, the Jew could point to the teachings of his ancient sages as proof of the fact that, in this respect at least, they were far in advance of the general standard of their time. The Jew, therefore, was content to see his neighbour continue his manner of life and belief, and believed that thereby he was fulfilling his duty to God and man. The Gentile on the other hand felt that the Jew's continued persistence in his traditional beliefs was a constant insult to God and man. What resulted was not therefore a reciprocal enmity ; it was a unilateral persecution.

True, some of the lower elements among the Jews could not fail to be affected, and to look forward to the time when they would be able to avenge themselves against their eternal persecutors. But this attitude of mind was consistently and nobly combated by the spiritual leaders of Judaism and by the solid good-sense and humanity of the Jewish people. Hence, even at the period when Church and State united to oppress and persecute the Jew, when he was considered a perpetual enemy in law and treated as a perpetual enemy in life, when Christianity in a word had declared war on Judaism and was engaged in a perpetual campaign against it, Judaism never reciprocated by declaring war in its turn. There were (to carry on the metaphor) a few isolated *francs-tireurs*, perhaps even some guerilla bands, who replied to the onslaught in kind. But Judaism, as a religious system, refused to retaliate, and even at the darkest moment repeated its pacific conviction : " The righteous

of all peoples and creeds have a part in the world to come."

Hence, when in the course of the nineteenth century the persecution slackened, peace was re-established automatically. Christianity tacitly sloughed off some of its more intolerant ideas. Judaism did not need to do this, though it was necessary for some Jews to unburden their minds of the resentment which had grown up as the result of the long centuries of suffering. Thus, in the countries of toleration in the West, something approaching normal inter-denominational relations was established. Peace between Jew and Christian became a fact ; and Jewry will never forget the generous sympathy which it received from various Christian bodies and various Church leaders in the age of trial which set in during the fourth decade of the twentieth century.

In this, the worst features of the mediæval scene have been imitated and exacerbated. In Central Europe, from the shores of the Baltic almost to the coasts of Africa, a war of extermination is being waged against all persons of Jewish "blood". It is not only, as at the beginning, that they are being excluded from positions of prominence, in which they may do something to collaborate further in the development of European civilisation, but that every channel of livelihood is being blocked, while every way of escape is cut off and (in the words of one Nazi official in Vienna) only "the way to the Danube is still open". Moreover, this example, set by the central European nation which most prides itself on its material culture, is infecting the smaller nations East and South-East, and seems about to overwhelm millions more of unhappy, defenceless human beings, whose sole crime is that of having preserved their identity in a hostile world or (in the case of a minority) of having tried to discard it too rapidly. It seems that the world is on the brink of a disaster unique in history, irretrievably involving millions of souls.

Yet still, there is no reciprocal enmity, no "warfare" between Jew and Gentile, even in these stricken areas. It is true that the Nazi power is waging a campaign of extermination, but the Jews, far from reciprocating, and far from returning hatred with hatred, are not even defending themselves in a concerted spirit. Their resentment, so far as it exists, is directed only against those immediately responsible. They look forward not to revenge, but simply to a change of heart on the part of their oppressors : and their prayer is in the spirit of the Jew Jesus : "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do !"

Yet in its way this recrudescence of barbarism has done more to bring Jew and Gentile together than any other sequence of events in recent history. For, with persecution extended not only against Jews but against all who work for peace, all who think for themselves, all who hold that the soul is more important than the sword and that even the State cannot override conscience, persecuted Jewry has found itself in a company of suffering which a few years ago would have been impossible. The conflict in the world to-day

is not between the different interpretations of the pathway to heaven, but between light and darkness, between God and His enemies, between Christ and Antichrist, as the Middle Ages conceived it. On the one side are ranged those who believe in an ultimate force for good: on the other, those who believe in no good but force. It is no mere accident, thus, that the most influential voice that has been raised against the persecution of those of Jewish descent is that of the Pope, and that members of the English episcopate have shewn themselves to-day more articulate than the statesmen whom one would have expected to be the heirs to the spirit of Gladstone.

There can be no question that, in the long run, the onslaught against Civilization will be repulsed. That consummation may take a long time, indeed. It may not be realised in our day, or for long after. Yet, however long these new Dark Ages may last, however widely they may spread, however deeply they may be implanted, the time must come at last when they will end. It is to be hoped that, when this happens, the new-found solidarity, between all those of whatever denomination who believe that man has a soul and who abhor the power of evil, will not end with it. It is to be hoped that those who have been tested and welded together in the crucible of suffering will continue to realise that, in prosperity as in adversity, there is more to unite than to divide them. They will be able to exemplify in their relations that old ideal—still remote, but as I believe more explicitly recognised in Judaism than in any other religious system of the West—of friendly associates, working for the same object through different channels, and "except in opinion, not disagreeing".

CECIL ROTH

Hath not a Jew eyes? hath not a Jew hands, organs, dimensions, senses, affections, passions? fed with the same food, hurt with the same weapons, subject to the same diseases, healed by the same means, warmed and cooled by the same winter and summer as a Christian is? If you prick us do we not bleed?

—SHAKESPEARE

WORLD PEACE

BRITAIN AND HER BROWN MILLIONS

[D. F. Karaka was the first Indian President of the Oxford Union Society and the author of *The Pulse of Oxford* which was published in the same year, 1933. —Eds.]

It is now some three hundred and fifty years since a small party of enterprising Britons first stepped on the shores of India. With a charter of monopoly from Parliament tucked in their breast-coat pockets they arrived in a little sailing boat that was blown this way. It was an ill wind that blew no one any good.

Time passed and there came into being the East India Company. They were in India essentially for the purposes of trade. They had, we were told, no ulterior motives. Gradually they began to find ways and means of protecting their growing trade, till eventually they got together a little militia of their own, complete with rifle and musket. It was only to protect themselves in an India which was being constantly overrun by hordes of invading troops. Soon they began to protect the Indians from themselves and from this microcosm sprang the greatest Empire since the Romans.

That is the background of the problem of peace between Britain and her brown millions. *No Empire has ever brought peace to its conquered subjects. No Empire can or ever will. The very idea of Empire is repugnant to the idea of peace.* It connotes an inequality of status between those who govern and those who are governed. It leads to the struggle for existence between those who must eventually fight for their independence and those who must oppose it. It necessitates at some time or other that eventual clash of interests between the forces of Imperialism and those who have come within its sway. In such a state there can be no peace.

But what is peace? As I write now in the quiet of the evening and of my home, my world is at peace. I can hear the tinkling of a piano in the next apartment. I do not know what it is, but this music I hear has the discipline of Bach. Discipline, yes! It is a discipline that does not seem to be artificially enforced. It moves gently, re-echoing the peace that prevails. I call it peace. So that peace is a relative term. It varies in meaning according to circumstance. When the Great War was over, this world came mistakenly to the conclusion that the new state of events was Peace. On scraps of paper, with much ceremonial, they wrote it down that there was peace in this world, from the moment of the cessation of war.

It was, as I said, a mistaken idea. The years that followed the grim struggle have shown the anguish, the suffering, the pain that was yet in store for this world. A broken Germany, an uprooted Russia, a dismembered Hapsburg Empire; Allies that were crippled by the victory; Europe in chaos. The bread-lines

presented a pathetic picture of the aftermath. The hungry, the homeless, the unemployed. Was that peace ? Far better, some thought, to have found peace in the cold earth of some Flanders field.

Many years have elapsed since the signing of that ill-fated Treaty of Peace at Versailles. They have been years of alarms and excursions. The word that occurred most frequently in our vocabulary was "Crisis". Economic, monetary, financial crisis ; crisis in Germany—the fall of the mark ; crisis in Czechoslovakia—the rise of the mark ! China, Abyssinia, Mexico, Palestine, India, Spain ! There was a crisis in nearly every part of the world. There was no peace. Whatever the cause, the effect was the same—it was that the people of this world were made perpetually conscious of the absence of that mental calm without which there can be no peace. Yet we have called the years that followed 1918, the years of peace.

It is with that idea of peace that I want to approach the problem of India. It is not enough that during the many years of British rule in India there have not been on Indian soil the wars that have happened in Europe. It is the unrest and the unhappiness that have come over the people of India that have created the greatest barriers against peace in this part of the world which is my country and my home.

Let us review some comparatively recent events. We go back now to the time when a portrait of Queen Victoria hung in nearly every middle-class Indian home. It was the symbol of our subjection to the Empire. The gracious lady had on some occasions talked about the equality of her subjects and the absence of any distinction of caste, creed or colour between those over whom she claimed to have justly ruled. All this was in the best Victorian tradition. Tennyson had echoed these sentiments in his poetry, and Morley's *Compromise* was perhaps representative of the attitude of mind which prevailed in England at that time.

We were content, because we had known nothing different. As in the Roman Empire we had risen from the status of slaves to that of " freedmen ". Freedmen, mark you. Not free men. That was the essential difference. There was with us that background which we could never shake away. We could always get thus far, but no further, unless we were prepared to shake ourselves free from that conception of Empire into which we had been absorbed. As things stood at that time, there was neither the inclination, nor the possibility of doing this and we were, therefore, content to be glorified variations of freedmen, without ever being free. There was a lethargy of mind and body that made any change in the existing order impossible. We began to shape the future course of our lives on the assumption that we were and would always remain a subject nation.

Time marched on. Everywhere in this world the old order had given place to new. Even in England itself the dogmas and shibboleths which were treated as Gospel truth in the days of Queen Victoria, now began to be questioned and doubted. The people of England wanted an answer

to every question. There was no immunity given even to a proverb. The philosophers and thinkers who followed in the wake of the Victorian era gave birth to a new age of thought. The symbol of that age was the eternal question-mark and its motto was crystallized in the one word, " Why ? ".

The Great War in Europe encouraged this new idea. Life was so uncertain that one ceased to live it according to the old standards of morality. One began to be painfully conscious of the fact that dead men were all alike whether they were white or black, Indians or Englishmen, Germans or Jews. There was a levelling process in death—and in so far as the war was the cause of so many deaths, it encouraged this idea of the equality of men.

While such was the English scene, there sprung in the hearts of the Indian people a desire to be equals in the great tribes of mankind. They wanted that no Empire should ever tread them down. They suddenly awoke to a sense of national consciousness. It was due to the rise of Gandhi in the Congress. The authority of the Government began to be questioned and a national movement was launched, which was calculated to overthrow this government carried on in the name of the people of India, but at times detrimental to Indian interests. The so-called peace that this government maintained was by force. All efforts which endangered the stability of the government were crushed in the name of law and order. The ruthless massacre at Amritsar, the crawling order, the various lathi charges, the persecution of the Congress, the suppression of Jathas were all done ostensibly for the sake of the peace of India.

So that when we talk about peace between Britain and her brown millions, we must be clear as to our conception of peace. The fact that commerce and industry were able to carry on, while the flower of Indian manhood was behind bars serving terms of imprisonment for political offences can hardly be said to have inaugurated an era of peace. Peace that is maintained at the point of the sword is only an armed peace. It is peace under protest—only so long as that sanction which enforces it is maintained. Withdraw that sanction, and chaos will inevitably follow. Britain can give India no other kind of peace.

We have different ideas as to the peace we want in our country. We want something of the contentment that is the heritage of man. We want to see our countrymen walk with their heads held high, their bodies strong, not bent and stooped. We want to hear something different from the wailing of those hungry, half-naked millions, whose dark bodies sweat in the heat of a tropical sun for a meagre, grim, bare existence. We want to see established a new order of things, a new economic system, which will not make it possible for a handful of foreign capitalists to exploit the natural and the human resources of our country to glorify an Empire to which we belong not by choice but by reason of conquest. We want to hear the laughing of little children, who are now begging in the streets because begging is all they are

fit for. We want to see a higher standard of education in our country and a more just distribution of revenue. We want to see the social services developed and fed, before giving exorbitant salaries to Generals, and high officers of state. We want, in short, a government that can reasonably claim to be able to work for the people without any let or hindrance from Whitehall or elsewhere.

These are only a few of the conditions precedent to the existence of peace between Britain and India. The history of British rule in India, when told in terms of the slaughter of innocents, the persecution of honest-to-God nationalism, the oppression of the people, is not one which will help the future relationship between these two countries. The past will always stand in the way of peace. The struggle of the Indian people is still too fresh in our minds for us to endorse a Pax Britannica. No two countries could find it more difficult to find a future basis of peace. We can only try.

There is something else that peace implies. It is self-respect. We have seen the demoralization of a people who have been brought up to believe that they must always remain a subject nation. We have watched the humiliation that our brown millions have suffered at the hands of the white oppression. In spite of the most glib utterances of the late Queen Victoria, we have seen a most ungallant distinction of colour maintained in the very country where to be dark is natural. We have seen how our own people have been treated like lepers in the country of their birth as if it were in the natural course of justice. We have seen—and this is worse—our people acquiesce in the treatment they have received. We have lived, I am ashamed to say, for many years without one ounce of self-respect.

That was the India that we have only just left around the corner. But we have not turned sufficiently round. The shadow of the past can still be seen, as sometimes we turn back to see how far we have moved. All this will still hinder our quest for peace. Even so we go on.

Tomorrow—when this strife is over —we may yet find peace.

Tomorrow—perhaps.

D. F. KARAKA

May not brave submission, heroic surrender of armed defence, quiet non-resistance to the evil of Force, be the true way to Peace for which millions long and which would wither in War?

—SIR MICHAEL SADLER

THE WRITER IN RELATION TO WAR AND PEACE

[Hermon Ould was a conscientious objector who suffered during 1914-1918. In the inauguration of the P. E. N. Club, its founder Mrs. Dawson Scott, and its first President John Galsworthy, secured in him an able and devoted lieutenant who has served for years as General Secretary of the P. E. N. We agree with Mr. Ould that "the writer is the most important instrument for conveying ideas" and therefore, from one point of view, the education of the writer himself is the most important item in any programme for the abolition of war and the establishment of lasting peace.

In her magazine, *Lucifer* for November 1889, H. P. Blavatsky writing under the caption "The Tidal Wave" referred to "a new race of authors" and said that it is "those who amidst the present wholesale dominion of the worship of matter, material interests and SELFISHNESS, will have bravely fought for human rights and *man's divine nature*, who will become, if they only win, the teachers of the masses in the coming century, and so their benefactors. But woe to the XXth century if the now reigning school of thought prevails, for Spirit would once more be made captive and silenced till the end of the now coming age." She described the task of that new race of authors : "In order that one should fully comprehend *individual* life with its physiological, psychic and spiritual mysteries, he has to devote himself with all the fervour of unselfish philanthropy and love for his brother men, to studying and knowing *collective* life, or Mankind. Without preconceptions or prejudice, as also without the least fear of possible results in one or another direction, he has to decipher, understand and *remember* the deep and innermost feelings and the aspirations of the poor people's great and suffering heart. To do this he has first 'to attune his soul with that of Humanity', as the old philosophy teaches ; to thoroughly master the correct meaning of every line and word in the rapidly turning pages of the Book of Life of MANKIND and to be thoroughly saturated with the truism that the latter is a whole inseparable from his own SELF."—EDS.]

It is possible that some day the cinema and the radio will usurp the place of the written word : the tendency seems to be that way. The effort of looking at the screen is extremely unexacting : all is made very plain, all subtleties are commonly avoided, and very little comes from the sound-track that does not go without saying. Broadcasters, whose audience is numbered in millions, are also expected to avoid the abstruse and to give utterance to nothing that cannot be grasped at a first hearing.

But for the present, the writer is the most important instrument for conveying ideas, through books, plays, essays, reviews, poems, and newspapers ; it is the writer who is in most cases behind the story of a film, and even a radio talk has to be written before it is read. This being the case, what calling is more heavily charged with responsibility than the calling of authorship ? Is there any other profession with more potentialities for good—or evil ? Politicians may claim that they have greater power, but their claim could hardly be substantiated ; for their influence is by its nature ephemeral, whereas the influence of the writer is enduring

or ephemeral only in proportion to his gift for expressing the truth and expressing it effectively. Writers, it is true, may sometimes be affected by politicians ; politicians can scarcely fail to be affected by writers.

A lengthy thesis might be written on the subject of the part played by authors in the problem of peace and war, and would need to be preceded by a very thorough investigation. In this article I will touch briefly on some of the lines which the investigator would have to follow, and suggest, if I am able, how authors who believe that peace is preferable to war may serve their faith without sacrificing their artistic integrity.

The first stubborn fact which our investigator would have to accept is that authors are human beings, with no fewer prejudices than other human beings ; it cannot be assumed that they are necessarily and always on the side of the angels, nor that they are immune from the passions and fears, the sudden impulses and mob emotions, which sweep other human beings off their feet. This fact need not seriously disturb the pacifist; for after all it will be generally admitted that the love of peace, the desire to maintain it and to keep war at bay, is almost universal ; and it may therefore be taken for granted that if authors are subject to the weaknesses of other mortals, they are also sharers in their strength and in their hopes. The events which recently brought Europe to the verge of war served at least one good purpose in revealing, as never before since 1919, the abhorrence with which war is regarded by the common people of all countries, including their authors ; and we may believe without straining credulity that writers in the countries where literary expression is muzzled are no less pacific, if less frank, than their brethren elsewhere.

The range of belief on the subject of peace and war is very wide, stretching from the uncompromising pacifism of Jesus down to the glorification of war as preached and practised by Mussolini. There are those who, following Tolstoy, would never resist evil, gladly enduring offences committed against them ; there are those who, like Gandhi, would offer non-violent resistance to injustices meted out to them ; there are those who would take up arms in a war which they considered just and would refuse to take up arms in a war which they considered unjust. There are others whose belief in the sanctity of the State is so profound that they would respond unquestioningly to its call, and yet others who believe that to be conscripted for the purpose of indiscriminate slaughter is the ultimate degradation. Some, like the Plymouth Brethren, would allow themselves to be organised by a country engaged in war so long as they were not asked to kill with their own hands ; some would make munitions but would not use them, and there are some who experience a kind of mystical exaltation when engaged in fighting. All these have their representatives among men, and therefore, by hypothesis, among authors, and for this reason we may expect that all these points of view have their exponents among literary men (and women). Leaving aside the work of journalists,

who, generally speaking, are compelled to express the editorial views of their journals and thus cannot be regarded as entirely free agents, we may attempt a rough classification of literary work bearing on our subject.

(a) Works which are directly propagandist.

(b) Works which are indirectly propagandist.

(c) Works which are not directly concerned with war or peace, but nevertheless evoke the thoughts or emotions which nourish war or peace.

(d) Works which are not included in any of the other three categories—and this is a relatively small class, and does not concern us here.

In the first class we should have to include the innumerable books and pamphlets issued by peace societies, as well as such works as *The Power of Non-Violence*, by Richard B. Gregg, *Ends and Means* by Aldous Huxley, Gandhi's *Hind Swaraj*, Middleton Murry's *The Necessity of Pacifism*, several of Tolstoy's works but particularly *The Kingdom of God Is Within You*, A. A. Milne's *Peace With Honour*, Bertrand Russell's *Which Way to Peace?*, Beverly Nichols's *Cry Havoc!* and F. Yeats-Brown's reply to it, *The Dogs of War*. Books advocating pacifism, many of them of great importance, are innumerable. Those advocating war, on the contrary, seem to be very few; they are for the most part books glorifying imperial expansion, in which war is extolled not so much for its own virtues, but as a means to a desirable end. Books on military strategy are, of course, in a class apart and need not be considered here. Poets have often sung the glories of war and the necessity of war, and have found in wartime-comradeship a fruitful theme. But, on the whole, the pacifist may take comfort in the thought that authors are more ready to lend their talents to the service of peace than of war and that while many of the greatest writers, now and in the past, have espoused the cause of peace and have advocated it in literary masterpieces, it would not be easy to point to a masterpiece consecrated to the advocacy of war.

The second class—works which are indirectly propagandist—include all the books in which war plays a more or less prominent part. Histories and biographies in this class are plentiful, but it is probable that works of fiction account for many more. The authors of such works do not, as a rule, express a point of view so definitely that one would be justified in placing them in the first category but, nevertheless, the reader inevitably rises from the perusal of their books with an impression, conscious or unconscious, that the author is in some degree for or against war, and he, the reader, is influenced in proportion to the author's power and to his own susceptibility. It is a numerous class, ranging from such masterpieces as Tolstoy's *War and Peace* to the unimportant effusions of minor novelists. The war of 1914-1918, which was the most cataclysmic event of our century, has been the background and the chief theme of thousands of works whose influence cannot be computed. Who

would venture to gauge the power of such novels as Remarque's *Im Westen Nichts Neues* and Henri Barbusse's *Le Feu* and *Clarté*, or such plays as Sheriff's *Journey's End*, circulated or performed all over the world in dozens of languages? In addition to books expressly dealing with the war—such as Edmund Blunden's *Undertones of War*, H. G. Wells's *Mr. Britling Sees It Through*, Richard Aldington's *Death of a Hero*, Irene Rathbone's *We That Were Young*, Ernest Hemingway's *A Farewell to Arms*, and the poems of Wilfred Owen, Siegfried Sassoon, and many others—there have been a multitude of books in which the war has played an important if not the leading rôle, and no prominent writer, in England at any rate, was able to ignore it: see, for instance, Galsworthy's later Forsyte series and specifically *Saint's Progress*; Somerset Maugham's *Ashenden* and *For Services Rendered*, Shaw's *Heartbreak House*, and so on.

Here again the pacifist may take heart of grace from the fact that very few of these writers have exploited war in order to glorify it. They have found opportunities to applaud human courage and endurance; they have pictured human beings behaving finely in tragic circumstances; they have discovered humour in odd places; and they have shown that, if war is generally degrading, it is not invariably so but is also capable of awakening latent nobility. But at the back of most of their books is the expressed or unexpressed conviction that even though war may be an evil it is necessary to endure, it is not one of the nobler activities of man.

And then there is the third class, the overwhelming majority of books, which do not touch on war or peace at all, but play their part in shaping the minds of their readers, evoking the thoughts and emotions which nourish war or peace. Here we are treading on dangerous ground. Interference with the freedom of the artist to express anything sanctioned by his conscience is not to be tolerated. But perhaps it is not heretical to hint that even artists sometimes stand in need of enlightenment and education; that humility is not one of the more operative virtues of the artist; that all artists are not all the time alive to their responsibility towards the world, and that, in any case, no writer would be the worse for a re-examination of the nature of his vocation and of his manner of fulfilling it.

The potency of the written word is admitted, and words are the author's tools; the least that can be asked of him is that he should not misuse his tools. Mr. Aldous Huxley has recently entered a plea for exactitude in the use of words and has shown that a pretty metaphor or figure of speech may cover a very ugly fact. When Mr. Asquith in 1914 declared that we would never sheath the sword until the war was won, he employed a romantic figure of speech which concealed the fact that, in order to achieve our ends, "we" were willing to use machine guns, tanks, poison gas, or any other weapon which science, prostituting its gifts,

might invent. If authors were always to make sure that they knew the implications of the word they were using, the cause of truth would be served and much loose thinking would be avoided. There are some words so discredited that it is almost impossible to employ them and be sure of conveying one's meaning. What do we mean by words like nationalism, patriotism, loyalty, honour, peace? Why should it be assumed, for instance, that loyalty is a virtue? Blind loyalty to one's class, to one's country, race, club, profession, family, may be, in given circumstances, an offensive, separative emotion that ought to be suppressed. We have lately heard much of "Peace with Honour" a slogan that may carry comfort to the thoughtless but has little connection with abstract truth or justice. What does "peace" mean? A respite from war which can only be maintained so long as the potential belligerents are willing to groan under the burden of taxation exacted to supply bombing-planes, incendiary and high explosive bombs, poison gas and gas-masks, tanks, machine guns, and all the other instruments of war! What sort of honour is meant? Would the Czechs agree to the British or French definition of the word?

It would be a service to the world and incidentally to literature if some one would compile a new glossary of debatable words. In the meantime, authors should beware lest by employing tarnished words they should give utterance to thoughts not in their minds.

War and peace are born in the hearts of men. Harmony can never be reached in the world until it has been achieved in the hearts of men. Nations are only men writ large. The author who wishes to serve peace can best do so by making truth the touchstone of all his work, by using his gifts to illumine dark places, by refusing to pander to base, separative emotions, by refraining from expressing ideas that would inflame racial, national or personal hatred, and first of all and all the time, by striving to attain peace within himself. All this he may do without sacrificing one iota of his artistic integrity or freedom.

HERMON OULD

YOUTH AND THE BASIS OF PEACE

[Kwaja Ahmad Abbas was a delegate from India to the Second World Youth Congress held at New York in August 1938. His review of the work done there is heartening. Will the youth of the world seriously consider the plan put forward in this issue by Dr. C. E. M. Joad?—EDS.]

In a small town called Poughkeepsie, near New York, was recently held a conference which is likely to prove a great factor in the spiritual reorientation of the world's endeavour for peace. Attended by five hundred young people from fifty-four different countries, representing such diverse organisations as the Y.M.C.A. and the Young Communist League, and convened at a time when half the world was under threat of imminent war, and national passions and jealousies were once again being inflamed to white heat, the greatest achievement of the World Youth Congress was that it was held at all. As was only natural, discussions on various political, economic and social questions revealed considerable differences of opinion and outlook, but the one issue on which there was amazing unanimity was the desire for peace and the will to achieve it at all costs. It was not merely an academic interest in pacifism. The delegates included youths from China and Spain who knew of the horrors of war from much too recent personal experience. The Czechs, on the eve of the Zero Hour in the history of their country, were expecting national mobilization any moment. There was an atmosphere of tense anxiety and, consequently, an almost desperate effort to minimize differences and rally round a common programme for peace.

What is of special significance is that *it was agreed on all hands that disarmament proposals or political and economic readjustments, by themselves, are not sufficient to establish peace on solid foundations and that they must be supplemented by agreement on a common ethical and philosophical basis.* One of the four commissions into which the main constructive work of the congress was divided was exclusively devoted to the discussion of this aspect of the problem. "Peace", it was declared, "is not merely the absence of visible war. A state cannot be considered peaceful where social injustice or political irresponsibility exist or *where the dominating motives of individuals are greed and power.*" The problem of establishing world peace was thus recognized as the problem of awakening the dormant social conscience and the proper education of the human mind. In other words, to achieve a state of peace, man must learn to devote himself to the service of the world community in a spirit of selfless endeavour rather than dissipate his energy—physical and spiritual—in futile struggle for selfish ends. Agreement on ethical and moral principles must of necessity precede the attainment of justice within nations and between nations. For, such an agreement alone can unite the people of the world in a common

endeavour for peace and justice.

All the delegates were agreed that their goal was the Brotherhood of Man, and they were equally concerned with the development of human personality, freely devoted to the service of the community, as the only stable foundation of a better world, even though they approached it from widely divergent angles. Some regarded this value of personality as something inherent ; others based a like evaluation upon the religious approach, saying that man is of worth because he is a creature and an instrument of God ; others felt that his highest value emerges and is expressed only *in the community* or in the stream of creative humanity, and is defensible regardless of the religious issue. After much discussion and exchange of views, both those who were motivated by belief in God as the supreme authority or by other religious convictions and those who considered the welfare of mankind to be the ultimate value were able to find common agreement on the basis of fundamental ethical principles. They affirmed :—

(1) Man's loyalty to religious or philosophical truth which comes before allegiance to any institution or individual.

(2) Complete freedom of the individual for self-development and for the right to work ; for freedom of speech, association and action.

(3) The truth that personality can only be developed in and through service to the common good.

(4) The principle that ideals must be expressed in action and love in the creation of human solidarity and co-operation.

This was, then, the basis on which further discussions proceeded. Freedom of conscience having been accepted as a fundamental principle, it was conceded that the goal of all the various faiths was the same, *viz.*, the establishment of the Brotherhood of Man and the development of human personality. But almost every one believed that dogma and belief in the outward form of religion were no substitutes for the spiritual regeneration that the world needed. Nor were labels and ritual of much value any longer, as they only helped to emphasize separatist and sectarian tendencies. *The need was felt for the vital content of religion to be divested of all unnecessary formulæ and trappings so that it can be used to unify—rather than divide—humanity in a common purpose.* In this task the World Youth Congress recognized and stressed the special responsibility of the youth members of the religious groups :—

Their understanding of the bases of peace must be shared and must be translated into activities which will lead to the realization of the principles held in common.

The task which youth set for itself is :—

(1) To work against the forces in human nature and society which cause war.

(2) To reaffirm the moral principles upon which a just and durable peace rests.

(3) To develop an international mind in youth, and those new forms of political, social and economic relationships which are essential for the advancement of civilization.

Realizing how easily war-mongers

are able to exploit youth's instinctive desire for adventure and heroic deeds, the Youth Congress stressed the need for a new sense of heroism which will recognize that the arts of peace and the service of mankind as exemplified in the lives of educators, doctors, nurses, explorers, social reformers and those who minister to the victims of injustice, call forth qualities of service and sacrifice which are more compelling than the much vaunted heroism of war.

It will be seen thus that having laid down the ethical and philosophical bases of peace, the Youth Congress hopes to work for peace by the twin methods of *Education* and *Organization*. We have all seen the futile efforts made by statesmen to secure peace by diplomacy and international conferences. At best they have succeeded in slightly restricting the calibre of guns and the tonnage of war ships. But even if complete disarmament be achieved it will not mean the end of war, so long as we do not strive to annihilate the one supreme cause of war—man's greed and selfishness. It is true that wars are started by foolish or insincere politicians but they can surely be prevented by the united will of the people. A truly well-informed and enlightened public opinion is the only guarantee against war. But let not the often futile and sometimes dangerous half-education of most schools and colleges be confused with the education which, by proper emphasis on ethical and philosophical truths, would help to produce truly rational and enlightened human beings. Mass education on these lines needs proper organization, too. The World Youth Congress movement which is representative of over forty million young people of the world through their hundreds of organizations affiliated to it, will no doubt help to spread this new education. It is important, however, that in the day-to-day work of the affiliated organizations, proper emphasis should always be laid on the ethical and philosophical bases of peace. Moreover, steps should be taken to ensure the maximum amount of co-operation between the World Youth Congress movement and the large number of other adult organizations which are also striving for a better and more peaceful world, and which find themselves in practical agreement with the ethical principles adopted by the Congress at Poughkeepsie. Thus alone may we expect to usher in a new era of peace. But youth must not forget that to bring that about is its duty and its privilege.

KWAJA AHMAD ABBAS

WOMEN AND PEACE

"VIOLENCE IS OLD-FASHIONED"

[Stella Gibbons is a satirist whose delightful "Apologia" was published in our pages for April 1937. In this short article, describing herself as one of the millions of "Negative" women, she offers some very practical advice, which if followed by all women, especially by the "Positive", would go a great way towards the ushering in of world-peace. In the West teachers of the young are mostly women and there is a special message for them in this article.—EDS.]

The work which women can do to help Peace is governed, naturally, by the nature of the woman who undertakes such work.

The Positive woman, whose powers need to express themselves in action, can find plenty of work to do for what may be called Peace Defence. She may become an Air Raid Warden, or undertake any of the tasks suggested by the many Public Service organisations. Such work is necessary, and gives relief to fears, and to the desire to help Peace. I do not propose to discuss it in detail here because it is practical work, and this journal is more concerned with spiritual and ethical work.

The Negative Woman's position is more difficult. She cannot find relief in public work (though First Aid and Nursing might satisfy her) because she is not efficient, nor is she interested in public work. *Millions and millions of women, all over the world, are Negative women, whose love and interest are turned in a small circle, the circle which holds their husband, children and home.* I am more interested in these women, because they are *natural* women, and because I am one of them. I cannot speak for those women who drive cars, organise people, and are not afraid. I envy them, but I cannot understand them, for I am terrified of War and cannot drive myself into any state of mind in which I could think that War was right.

What can women like me do?

We can hide our fear. This is so difficult as to be almost impossible, but it must be done. Fear spreads like disease, poisoning and weakening. When some one asks us anxiously: "What do *you* think about things?", we must try to answer calmly and cheerfully.

One of the best answers is: "I don't think anything. How can I? The questions and answers involved are too huge, and how can an ordinary woman, without friends in high places, *know* or *think* anything? I try to get on with my everyday affairs, and to think with love of all the other ordinary people in the world."

Another task that ordinary women can do is to avoid gloating over hideous and horrible sights, on the pictures and in newspapers. Such spectacles as the crash of racing cars, aeroplane wrecks, rioting, bombed cities, infest the mind and shake the nerves, giving the loathsome contemporary "thrill" which is like a strong drug, and which must be repeated

in ever stronger "shots" if it is not to lose its power.

We can also try not to become hardened to the thought of violent death—on the roads, in the air, at sea. We can try to picture the human body as the most wonderful machine ever made, and to think of its violent destruction as a tragedy, as if a great work of art were to be smashed.

We can teach our children to be gentle and strong; gentleness and strength are the two most beautiful qualities in the nature of man.

At this point some one who disagreed with me might point out: "But the contemporary world *is* violent. If you want to survive, and your children to survive, they must learn to adapt themselves to the contemporary world. The dinosaurs perished because they could not adapt themselves."

The dinosaurs perished (I should answer) because they were old-fashioned, and *violence is very old-fashioned,* as old as Evil, as old as the world itself. It has long ago gone out of fashion with all the ordinary people in the world. Poor wretches, they cannot help being frightened and fascinated by its displays, like children at a firework show, *but they do not cling to it with hope.*

Women can also pray that Goodness, in its million different forms, may survive. The existence of Goodness is the one fact, certain as sunlight, of which we may be sure, and we can cling to this as Christians to their Cross and draw strength from it. If we pray to Goodness we can help It to survive.

Finally we can remember that the needs of the common people all over the world are the same: food, shelter, love, work, Deity. We can teach our children that.

I think this is all that ordinary women can do to help Peace.

STELLA GIBBONS

The World War took toll of 23 million lives—10 million soldiers and 13 million civilians. In addition, 23 million soldiers were wounded or missing, 9 million children were orphaned, and 10 million persons became refugees. This toll of lives was taken from the ablest and best of the world's population. Among those killed and disabled were many whose ability and genius would have made great contributions to the civilization and progress of mankind.

In money, the World War cost $337,846,000,000 of which 189 billions were spent directly and the remaining cost was in destruction of property and stoppage of industry. Of this amount, the cost to the United States for the war period was 32 billions of dollars. Continuing costs of the World War now total 19 billions of dollars, which, when added to the costs of the war period, make a staggering total of 51 billions of dollars.

Comparing military expenditures of 1913, the year before the World War, with those of the current fiscal year, Great Britain's has gone from $385,000,000 to $870,000,000; France's from $307,000,000 to $653,000,000; Germany's from $281,000,000 to $1,560,000,000; Italy's from $195,000,000 to $291,000,000; and the United States' from $245,000,000 to $962,000,000.

—Carnegie Peace Endowment Pamphlet No. 343

AMERICA AND WORLD PEACE

[James Truslow Adams writes about the contribution his great country has made and is making to the avoidance of wars.—EDS.]

A nation, like an individual, develops a character and an outlook as the years pass, and these form the background of any action taken or likely to be taken. As nations go, the United States is very young, though its innate conservatism and adhesion to tradition are shown in the fact that it has the oldest written constitution of any in the world. Winning its independence in 1783, its present form of government is scarce a century and a half old but the character and outlook we have mentioned have become set, and in nothing more than in the problems of war and peace.

America has always been opposed to militarization in any form. A nation of 130,000,000 people, it has a standing army of only 166,000 or less than one-quarter of the army and trained reserves of little Belgium. We have a navy, but it is possible to live here for years without ever seeing a person in military uniform. Personally I have not seen one since 1919. There can be few, if any, nations of the same size less war-minded. Other than minor wars with the native savages, as population expanded over the 3000 miles of otherwise empty continent, the United States has been engaged in only five wars in a hundred and fifty years, and of these only one, the Mexican War of 1848, can be considered in any way as a war of aggression. That of 1812 was due to outrages suffered for many years in the Titanic Napoleonic struggle in Europe; that of 1860 was a civil war for the overthrow of slavery and the preservation of the Union; that of 1898 with Spain was fundamentally for the freeing of Cuba, which we did not annex but which we set on her independent course; and we stayed out of the World War from 1914 to 1917 until it was no longer possible to maintain neutrality.

For over 120 years our boundary with the British Empire (Canada), of 5000 miles, has not had, on either side, a single vessel, fort or soldier, and the peoples of the two contiguous nations pass back and forth over the dividing line without passports and with scarcely a formality.

We have no military training, as in Europe, and although we submitted to conscription in the World War, our daily lives are concerned solely with the problems of civilian life and peace-time occupations, except in so far as the outer world intrudes its war problems upon us. The 8000 miles or so of oceans which border our shores, and the fact that there is no enemy, which could attack us, in the western hemisphere have helped to build up this pacific attitude toward life.

This, then, is our background, and *in considering what America*

can do for world peace it is well to have in mind what her example has done and is doing. One of the richest and most powerful nations in the world, she has preferred, on the whole, to leave other nations in peace, and to devote her wealth and energy to making a better life for her own citizens. Like Europe, the North American continent contains many races. Of our population of 130,000,000 only 58,000,000 are native, born of native-born parents. We have scores of millions of Germans, Italians, Czechs, Russians, Poles, Jews and all the other races of Europe but we all live in harmony. In my own daily life, I have a German cook, a Scotch maid, a Negro chauffeur, an Italian barber, a Polish woman to clean, etc., etc. We all get along together in friendliness and with none of those deadly antagonisms which threaten the peace of the world elsewhere. In our vast territory and with our great population we constitute not a *League* of Nations but a *union* of nations living as one family, helpful and kindly. This mere example, on so large a scale, constitutes, to my mind, a great contribution to world peace. If the diverse races elsewhere could learn to live together and cooperate as they do when they settle in the United States the problem of war would be solved. I know all too well the difficulties in the way of that when races are segregated in territorial compartments and with nationalism rampant. Nevertheless, the example is there, and while German and Czech hostility in Europe is threatening a new World War, my German cook here can chat pleasantly with the Czechs in this village where we all live together.

In spite of what many consider the crass materialism of America—and the reality of it also—America has always been a land of idealism. The "American Dream", as I have so often called it, has called to our land the tens of millions of immigrants from all others. They have come here to be free, to escape from the wars, oppressions and trammels of various sorts in older countries. From the beginning this dream of a better and peaceful world in which each man and woman could make the most of life, materially and spiritually, has persisted. Among the innumerable movements for the amelioration of suffering, that for world peace has always been prominent.

It started in an organized form soon after our first war as an independent nation in 1812-14, but we may here note only one extraordinary man, William Ladd. He was a sane idealist, and once remarked to an enthusiastic fanatic: "There is such a thing as going beyond the millennium. I am content to stop there." In 1840 he published his *Essay on the Congress of Nations,* and his scheme for an international court, as therein outlined, was presented at the Peace Conferences in Europe of 1848, 1849, 1850 and 1851, his plan being finally adopted as the basis of the Hague Court erected nearly eighty years after he began his preaching.

To-day there must be at least sixty peace societies of one sort and another carrying on their education and propaganda in this country.

At the National Peace Conference held this year (1938) forty-two took active part directly in the work of the Conference. The most richly endowed of these, the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, was given $ 10,000,000 by the late Andrew Carnegie in 1910, and has continued its work steadily since. There are, however, as I have said, scores of others, each working on its own lines and with its own particular ideas, such as the National Committee on the Cause and Cure of War, various church organizations, the Association of University Women, the American Youth Congress, and others too numerous to list. It is natural that every shade of opinion, from Communism and complete Pacifism, should find its own organization, but the National Peace Conferences are designed to unite them in a workable programme as far as possible.

Aside from these differences of opinion, there has also been a general change of trend since the World War. Twenty years or so ago the drift of thought was toward bringing about universal peace. The years of disillusion which have followed have tended to concentrating effort on how to keep America out of the next war, which it is believed will occur, as the world will not have peace. This somewhat narrower but perhaps more practical aim at present, lies back not only of the programmes of many peace societies but of the legislation, wise or not, on the subject of neutrality, and of such Resolutions as the Ludlow, which narrowly escaped passage by Congress, and which would require a plebiscite of the entire people before any war could be started unless America were actually invaded. The difficulty of all such legislation is to envisage all the possible complexities of an international situation before it arises, but the keen interest shown indicates the intense desire of the people never again to be drawn into war if they can help it.

Aside from recollections of the last war, in which America suffered less than any other of the greater participants, the campaigns carried on by the many peace societies have had a profound effect on public opinion. The amount spent annually may be not more than $ 2,000,000, but this does not measure the amount of propaganda, or education, as you will. Advertising and the radio are widely used, and three societies alone send out each year some 2,500,000 pieces of literature adapted to all kinds of minds. It is stated that the advertising of World Peaceways will run this year (1938) to a circulation of 25,000,000. The effect of all this activity on public opinion has been rapidly cumulative. One of the characteristics of American political life, for better or worse, is the intense pressure brought on members of Congress by what are called "pressure groups", whether war veterans, farmers, Prohibitionists and many others. Among these groups those devoted to peace have recently become one of the most powerful, and there is some anxiety lest they should become so greatly so as possibly to tie the hands of government in the case of a "just"

war. It is probable, however, as yet, that national feeling would make itself felt, for *America although intensely pacific is not, as a whole, pacifist. It wants by every means to avoid war but does not believe in non-resistance under all circumstances.*

The government, like the people, has in general backed every plan to avoid war. It was by means of the American President that the Russian-Japanese War was brought to an end ; and although it was not successful, the League of Nations was written into the Treaty of 1919 by another President. Especially in the field of arbitration as a means of avoiding war has American influence been felt. Innumerable boundary and other questions with the British Empire, as well as the celebrated "Alabama Claims", have been peacefully adjusted, and under Wilson America made treaties with thirty other nations providing for peaceful settlement of disputes by arbitration. In recent years America, in the Kellogg Pact and other treaties, has done all possible to outlaw war as a method of solving disputes. The present Secretary of State, Mr. Hull, last year stressed as the main points in our national policy, "peace, above all and foremost, through national and international self-restraint" and other means, including faithful observance of treaties, the revitalizing of international law, rehabilitation of world trade, the lowering of trade barriers, and the reduction of armaments.

In a world now armed to the teeth, mad with the idea of nationalism and national self-sufficiency, and with dictators whipping their peoples up to a frenzy of military pride and the glorification of war as a means of national aggrandizement, it is difficult to say what further contribution to peace can be made by America. Enough, however, has been said in this short article to show what the attitude and strivings of both the Americans and their government are. Both will be found in the future doing everything possible in practical ways or in the sphere of mind and ideals, to diminish the dangers to world peace in general and to keep America out of war in particular. The world is so closely bound together that it might likely be impossible for America not to be dragged into a new World War should one come, but the weight of public opinion has become so strongly against it that the decision would be a difficult and certainly not a hasty one. In other words, there is in the world a solid block of 130,000,000 people determined and working to avoid all wars as far as possible, and to keep out of any themselves. In a world whirling on the winds of military ambition and passion, that in itself is no slight contribution to peace.

JAMES TRUSLOW ADAMS

CRUELTY AND WORLD PEACE

[Hamilton Fyfe served as a War Correspondent with the French, Russian, Roumanian, Italian and British armies during the Carnage of 1914-18. He acted as Hon. Attaché with the British War Missions to the U. S. A. in 1917. He was in charge of British propaganda in Germany and among the German armies in 1918. Thus he has had varied experience of war conditions.

Cruelty manifests in times of peace in various ways and unmistakably contributes its quota as a preparation for war, and it is well to keep in mind in reading the indictment of the churches in the following article the remark of Mr. Fyfe : "Organized religion and cruelty have gone hand in hand."—EDS.]

What is cruelty? Many would answer "inflicting pain". That is incomplete. Cruelty is "inflicting pain with enjoyment".

In all states of human existence a good deal of pain has to be inflicted one way and another. Surgeons must operate sometimes without an anæsthetic. Even when the pain of the cutting is dulled, wounds cause pain later. Doctors are obliged to hurt many whom they examine.

Employers refusing higher wages or shorter hours may sharply pain their employees, and may themselves be injured by strikes. Children suffer momentary pain when they are not allowed to overeat or are sent to bed because it is bedtime, although they are not sleepy. No cruelty is associated with any of these acts. No enjoyment is drawn from them.

To hit out in sudden irritation at a child or a dog may be an inexcusable loss of temper, but is not cruel : we take no pleasure in the blow—indeed, we are sorry for it at once. The ground for opposing flogging and caning is that punishment inflicted in cold blood is usually cruel. Those who inflict may talk about its hurting them "as much as it hurts you", but nearly always they get pleasure out of it.

Not only is causing pain unavoidable in all stages of human existence : it is necessary also to kill. We must kill creatures that are dangerous to life or health—flies that poison food, rats which carry disease, man-eating tigers, bears in the mountains, deadly snakes in the plain.

How any one can reconcile this with belief in a merciful God and Father of all creation I have never been able to understand, but there it is. And most people consider it necessary to kill for food also. (Necessary, I mean, for some one else to kill sheep so that they may eat mutton, and oxen so that they may have beef, and pigs so that the "appetising" smell of breakfast bacon may not fail them!)

But those who slaughter animals for food seldom take any pleasure in the act, unless it be the pleasure of doing the job as swiftly and painlessly as may be. They are not cruel, nor need there be any cruelty in killing dangerous insects or animals.[1]

Animals themselves kill for food. Almost every species eats some other species. They kill also for safety.

[1] Is this really true? And what about the coarsening of the nature of those engaged in slaughtering?—EDS.

But there is no cruelty in their killing. Animals cannot be cruel. *Cruelty is a mental state possible only to the self-conscious.* It is not instinctive ; it is an aberration of the reasoning faculty.

Those who attempt to excuse the cruelty of men by saying that animals are cruel must be either ignorant or dishonest. A dog appears to enjoy fighting, but the appearance deceives. He believes that other dogs are his enemies and that he must defend himself against them. Cats may seem to delight in playing with mice, but they are merely exercising their quickness of sight and spring. They do it as readily with a reel of cotton or ball of paper.

Even if there were cruelty in nature, that would not justify cruelty in man, for man boasts of being superior to animals. But *cruelty is not found in animals, it is peculiar to man. Not born in man, so far as I can judge, but introduced by wrong teaching, evil tradition, despicable custom too readily followed.*

Teaching is wrong which represents animals as being of a different "creation" from man. Tradition is evil which regards cruelty as part of the human character, natural even in children. Custom is despicable when it sanctions the pursuit and killing of animals for amusement.

To these causes is due the lurking in almost every human heart of a liability to become cruel under stress of alarm or of grievances, real or imaginary. Yet another cause is the persistence of religious ideas dating far back. Organised religion and cruelty have gone hand in hand.

This tendency to be cruel can be easily aroused. By selfishness, by fear, by envy, by thwarted desire ; most easily of all by the incitement of agitators. I have seen in Russia peasants and Jews live peaceably together until the peasants, stirred up against the Jews by Tsarist police, killed them and burned their houses in a pogrom. In Germany Nazi agitation has made millions cruel to Jews, whom before they treated as fellow citizens. I have heard in America gentle, delicate women cry in frenzy for Negroes to be burned on mere suspicion of crime.

Agitators in favour of war have in many countries a simple task and in all countries, when war is going on, a still simpler. *Cruelty that has not shown itself before, nor even been suspected, is suddenly drawn forth, is even proclaimed a duty.*

When as war correspondent I sent a despatch to the London *Daily Mail* about a kindly action by a German soldier, I was told by the editor in a cable : "Nothing wanted about good, kind Germans. There are no good Germans but dead Germans." That was one reason why after the War so long as I remained with the paper I would do nothing but review books, though I was offered by Northcliffe any position I might choose.

Is it possible for men to kill each other in war without cruelty ? No, we could not kill in war unless we enjoyed it. This is not theory, but the fruit of experience. Those who managed the military side of the 1914-18 madness knew it to be true. They had soldiers taught to bayonet with relish, to be proud of skill

in picking off enemies with the rifle, to bomb with exultation, to gloat over the carnage they hoped to cause by the high explosive shells they sent over. Even by the staffs which directed operations from far behind the lines reports of heavy enemy casualties were enjoyed heartily. Cruelty is inseparable from war.

Not among fighting men only; among those also who stay at home. By them brutalities, which horrify when they are imputed to the enemy, are excused and rejoiced over when "our side" commits them. In them the lust for violence and death spreads from the enemy to any on "our side" who do not share it. The demand "Put 'em against a wall" is heard often. Killing becomes a mania.

That the respect for human life on which we pride ourselves during peace can be so quickly dropped proves it to have shallow roots. This shallowness must be attributed in part at any rate to the lack of respect for animal life shown generally among human beings.

Leaving aside the daily slaughter of countless animals for the needs of those who believe meat to be necessary as food, killing is made familiar and provided with a halo of fashion by Sport. Worrying stags, foxes, hares, otters; bringing down hecatombs of birds with the gun; torturing fish with hooks in their gills for the pleasure of "playing" them—these pastimes must dispose to cruelty of other kinds. Until we get rid of the idea that it is manly—and gentlemanly—to kill for fun, World Peace is likely to remain a far-distant ideal.

None can be excused now for supposing men and animals to be of different substance or believing that "God gave us animals to do as we like with", although this is still taught by the Churches, implicitly, if not directly.

That we are all members of one family, descended from fragments of transparent jelly floating in sea-water, ought now to be understood by everybody, and upon that follows the responsibility of kinship with everything that hath life. Killing, when necessary, must be merciful, painless, regretted, never enjoyed.

When we teach this to all children; when we reach a state of economic security for all in which no one will be compelled to deprive others of a living so that he may live himself; when exploitation, a form of cruelty, is treated as crime; and when the infliction of pain for pleasure, whether on each other or on animals, is branded as mean and cowardly, then there will be hope that wars may cease. But not till then.

HAMILTON FYFE

THE CHURCHES AND WORLD PEACE

THE BETRAYAL OF CHRIST

[Gerald Bullett writes about the failure of organized Christianity to live up to its profession of following the lead of the Prince of Peace.—EDS.]

We cry out for peace and we drift daily towards war. We live, all of us, in the shadow of a hideous menace; and it may be that even before these words reach print the Western world will have been overtaken by a catastrophe far exceeding in the scale of its destructiveness anything that mankind has suffered in the past. It has become a common place of contemporary comment that our moral intelligence has lamentably failed to keep pace with our command of physical power. We are like irresponsible children to whom some absent-minded uncle has given a brace of loaded pistols to play with: only a miracle can prevent our destroying ourselves. If the so-called Great Powers of the Western world become again involved in war, that will clearly be the end of Christian civilization.

But in what sense can Christian civilization be said to have ever begun? There, precisely, is the rub. Christianity has not failed, because, as has been said so often, Christianity has never been tried, except by a few rare individuals—if by Christianity we mean the way of Christ which is the way of love. Christianity has not failed: it is the Churches that have failed. And they have more than failed. They have, quite simply, betrayed Christ. They have plastered the person of Jesus with unctuous sentimentalities, and buried the wisdom of Jesus under a mountain of theology, threatening with the pains of hell all who neglected to applaud these activities. They have been careful to keep their "religion" for Sundays, and on other days of the week have acquiesced in all the manifest injustices as between man and man that are inherent in our fundamentally irreligious (because acquisitive) society. One does not contend that the Church, in England or elsewhere, should have identified herself with any one political party; but surely it is not too much to ask, of the professed followers of Christ, that they should pay something more than lip-service to the principles of universal brotherhood and co-operation. "The medieval Church", writes Dr. Coulton (the greatest living authority on the subject), "often succeeded admirably in patriarchal government; but.... she justified servitude, both in theory and practice", a servitude scarcely distinguishable to the lay mind from slavery itself. Children born to serfs were automatically condemned to servitude; and "the only great Schoolman, so far as I know, who disapproved on principle of hereditary bondage is John Wyclif" (*vide* Coulton's *Social Life in Britain*). And the main endeavours of the Churches in later ages and in our own times, have been directed towards keeping the poor in a state

of pious submission to their masters. They have, from time to time, exhorted the rich to be kind to the poor, out of their superfluity ; but they have been wilfully blind to the plain truth of the matter, which is that poverty in the midst of plenty is a thing no genuinely Christian society would tolerate for five minutes.

William Godwin, in 1793, declared the unequal distribution of property to be the source of all war. But this is only half the story. War, after all, is only aggressive egoism operating collectively, and the unjust distribution of the products of labour is an effect of egoism, not its cause, though an effect which may be (and is) the cause of other effects in its turn. By preaching a gospel of unremitting industry to the poor, and flattering the rich into believing themselves generous whenever they give away a fraction of what they don't need, the Churches in general (there are numerous individual exceptions) have helped to perpetuate a state of affairs which makes war ultimately inevitable. For in a society which encourages individual acquisitiveness, and rewards it with special honours, competition comes to be regarded as the natural thing ; and *war is competition carried to its logical conclusion.* There is nowadays a widespread sentiment against war, but the competitive spirit is still encouraged and applauded as a prime social virtue. The civilization that we have laboured to build is a civilization of worldlings ; and the " otherworldliness " of the Churches has contributed to that result because it was made a pretext for neglecting the study and reform of human relationships. We hear nowadays much praise of realism and much disparagement of ideals. But there is a cant of realism as well as a cant of idealism. The ideal and the real are not enemies, and no civilization is worthy of the name that does not attempt the perpetual translation of the one into the other. " Where there is no vision, the people perish." In the beginning is the idea, the aspiration. And the idea becomes fact. This is creative living, and anything short of it is spiritual death.

Jesus spoke " as one having authority ", an authority not coercive, from without, but one that commanded allegiance by an appeal to something within us which all men have in common. If the Christian Church ever possessed such spiritual authority, she has long since forfeited it by allying herself with Mr. Mammon and Mrs. Grundy and becoming the meek handmaiden of the secular government. The attitude of English ecclesiastics to war during the Great Carnage of 1914-1918 is faithfully described in Storm Jameson's *No Time Like the Present*: it provides some sorry reading. Miss Jameson, who describes herself as a " bigoted Protestant ", declares that her " only comfort, religious in source, during the War, was the magnificent encyclicals of the then Pope ". She can derive, I fancy, no such comfort from the attitude of the present Pope to the Spanish Civil War. Temporal power or spiritual power—you cannot have it both ways. As a Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge (the Rev. F. A. Simpson) said in 1914 : " The bank-

ruptcy of Christendom is not the bankruptcy of Christ, nor its madness His."

I do not, for my part, subscribe to the doctrine of absolute pacifism, that in no circumstances may violence be violently resisted. If it is ever legitimate to prevent by force the torture of a child (and there can be no two opinions about that), it is legitimate, as a last resort, when every conceivable effort at pacification has failed, to fight—if not for oneself, at least for the protection of others. War is not imposed on man from without, by forces beyond his control : it is simply the hideous by-product of his own undisciplined egoism, or self-will, as the anonymous author of the *Theologica Germanica* calls it.

If there were no self-will, there would be no proprietorship. There is no proprietorship in heaven ; and that is why contentment, peace, and blessedness are there... He who has anything of his own, or desires to have anything, is a slave ; and he who has nothing of his own, nor desires to have anything, is free and at liberty and is in bondage to no man.

If there were no self-will, there would be no proprietorship ; and if there were no proprietorship—that is to say, no exclusive, monopolistic possession of the means of life—there would be, there could be, no war. The Churches' failure to see and to declare this truth, in and out of season, gives the measure of their impotence. They have preferred to occupy themselves with technicalities and trivialities. Sleek and bland, and chattering together about the wickedness of reasonable divorce, they meekly follow their masters to the verge of destruction.

GERALD BULLETT

When he was come into Jerusalem, the whole city was moved, saying : Who is this ?

And the people said : This is Jesus the Prophet, from Nazareth of Galilee.

And Jesus went into the temple of God, and cast out all them that sold and bought in the temple, and overthrew the tables of the money-changers, and the seats of them that sold doves :

And he said unto them, It is written, My house shall be called the house of prayer ; but ye have made it a den of thieves.

—*Matthew*, XXI, 10-13.

THE WAR-MACHINE

[Dr. L. P. Jacks is an ardent champion of the cause of Peace and in this article puts his finger on the sorest spot of the problem. We recommend our readers to peruse his *Co-operation or Coercion?*—Eds.]

Thanks to the folly of centuries and the madness of recent times there has come into existence an all-devouring monster which consumes the substance of mankind, holds human life at its mercy, absorbs the energies of civilization, demoralizes the character of nations, poisons their minds and corrupts their politics. The name of this monster is the War-Machine. To this monster, this War-Machine, all so-called civilized nations are in a state of slavery, more or less complete, and it is the most abominable form of slavery which has ever existed in the world. The slavery of the Negroes in America or elsewhere was a trifling evil compared to it.

To understand the nature of the War-Machine and of the slavery it imposes on the nations we must think of it as a *single whole* and not as a collection of independent armaments, independently controlled, one in England, another in Germany, another in Japan and so on. These separate armaments are only the parts of it, like the wheels of a clock which function in relation one to another. Their independent action is illusory. If one speeds up, say the German, it speeds up the others. If one makes war others must make war with it, whether they want to or not; they will have to defend themselves, as we say; in other words, they answer war with war and, *as things now are, cannot do otherwise.* The War-Machine, considered in its true nature as a unitary whole, is not controlled by anybody. It goes forward under its own momentum which is prodigious and always increasing.

The League of Nations tried to control it but failed. Those who are supposed to control it, and are called "war-lords" are really the most abject of its slaves, though they are pathetically ignorant of the fact. The monster carries them on its back and will ultimately throw them off and trample them along with the rest of us,—unless, in the meantime, a way can be found to break its power, which is greater than that of any human government. It is the real ruler of mankind. It holds at its mercy the lives of hundreds of millions of men, women and children. At the present moment it is eating up the capital of the nations at the rate of 3000 million pounds per annum. Crushing taxation, conscription of wealth, mobilization of industry, national service, national register, A.R.P., etc., etc., in this country as in many others, are the different modes in which the slavery of mankind to the War-Machine makes itself manifest. One might define it, with a slight change of metaphor, as a device created by civilization for the express purpose of committing suicide, of blowing out its own brains. It has poisoned the brains of civilization already, poisoned them into madness, and will end—unless we can

master it—by blowing them out.

It has often been said that the modern world is ruled by machines. Yes, and *the machine which rules all the other machines is the War-Machine.* Here is one example. Not far from where I live there is a vast industrial organization whose original business was to produce a useful article which has nothing to do with war. At the present moment the machinery in that great factory and the men who work it have become a part of the national War-Machine and take their orders from a source which, when disguises are stripped off, is none other than military headquarters. Broaden that out and you have a picture of what industrial civilization the world over is coming to, and has largely come to already, under the rule of the War-Machine. Yes, we are ruled by machinery, and that is the kind of machinery we are ruled by. Has there ever been a tyranny more appalling, a phenomenon more sinister? *What price freedom now,* in democratic countries or in any other?

More than fifty years have now elapsed since Herbert Spencer, in "Man *versus* the State", predicted what he called "the Coming Slavery". "The Coming Slavery" has now come, but it has taken a form far more debasing to humanity and extended itself far more widely in the world at large than was anticipated by Spencer. Spencer's prediction was a revised version of two others which had been uttered nearly twenty years earlier, the first by Matthew Arnold in "Culture and Anarchy" and the second by Carlyle in "Shooting Niagara". (What a pity that so few people read these things nowadays, or even remember them!) Spencer predicted that the road we were travelling in 1884 would presently lead to the creation of a vast socialistic machine under which the competent and industrious minority would become mere beasts of burden, or slaves, crushed under the weight of the incompetent and idle majority whom they would be compelled to carry on their backs. Democracy would become "a system for the organized plunder of the minority"—as Dr. Inge has somewhere defined it. On those lines, if persisted in, industrial civilization, thought Spencer, would unquestionably come to grief.

Well, what has actually happened is something different and far worse: *the organized plunder of the whole community for the sustenance of the War-Machine.* Nor is it confined to this country alone; by no means! The phenomenon is European and indeed world-wide. Humanity has never found itself in a situation so dangerous. The suicide of civilization is in prospect.

A plain alternative confronts us. The War-Machine which now dominates civilization and marshals it (like Macbeth's dagger) on the way it is going will either be used for making war, almost certainly world-war, or it will remain unused. In either case the prospect is sufficiently disconcerting, and hardly less so in the second case than in the first. If the War-Machine fulfils its purpose in actual war-making we all know what will happen. But if the establishment of world peace (by one means or another) renders it useless, what then?

Consider our own country. Having organized the whole nation for war-making or fighting efficiency (camouflaged under the word "defence"), armed to the teeth for that purpose, trained hundreds of thousands of men (millions in other countries) for fighting by air, sea and land, "mobilized industry" as a feeder of the War-Machine and assigned to every man and woman a function in supporting it ("national service") —what is to become of all that if it should turn out that there is no war-making for the machine to do? It is inconceivable that a nation organized in this way for the business of war-making could be organized at a moment's notice for something else. The problem of converting swords into ploughshares is simple enough, but the problem of converting a great state that has organized itself for war —as all the great states are now doing or have done—into a state which has abjured war as an instrument of national policy and organized itself for peace, is another proposition altogether.

We are often told—so often, indeed, that one gets a little tired of hearing it—that Great Britain must rearm in order that she may be in a position to maintain the peace of the world. Does this mean that we are creating this vast armament, and bleeding ourselves white in the process, *in order to prevent its being used,* and that we are training men to fight by air, sea and land *in order that they may have no fighting to do*? It would seem so. But what could be more absurd? As well might we claim to promote teetotalism by distilling whisky and compelling everybody to drink it.

To get into the armament race has been easy. To get out of it is going to prove extremely difficult. Those who think of it as a mere affair of turning swords into ploughshares have not come even remotely in sight of what is involved in converting the war-machine into a peace-machine. For that, and nothing less than that, is the problem which now confronts the peacemaker. Even "putting a stop to war" is an inadequate measure of his task. His real problem is to break the power of the War-Machine which now holds the civilized world in bondage and "marshals" civilization the way it is going, destroying the vital resources of society, absorbing its best energies and demoralizing the remainder. Whether it eventuates in war or not, the certain end of it is human catastrophe.

Grounds of hope are to be found in the fact that all the world over the mutterings of a coming revolt against this intolerable tyranny may now be heard. Could means be found, and perhaps they will be, for bringing together *the peoples, as distinct from their governments,* there would arise in every nation a tempest of human wrath in which the power of the monster, now the greatest power on earth, would be effectually broken. To the individual citizen, pursuing his peaceful vocation, war has always been an abomination and a curse. But never before has it come so near to him and made itself felt so intensely as an evil in his own life. Never before has he found himself reduced so completely to a cog on the war-making machine. Never before has he fully realized his servitude and

been galled by it so intolerably. The hatred of war, once a sporadic phenomenon, is becoming a universal phenomenon and acquiring a firm grip on the mentality of the peoples. Even the war-lords, who rule the roost in the militarist countries, live in terror of the monster they have created. None knows better than they that, if "the army" were to turn against them for a single day, they would be done for—one of them had a near shave not long ago.

As a mere outbreak of wrath, as a violent uprising of slaves against the slave driver, the coming revolt against the War-Machine has no chance of succeeding. It will succeed only if and so far as it is constructively planned from the outset. Calling for moral rearmament or for "a change of heart" will by itself avail nothing. These things are not to be had by calling for them. Men do not change their hearts, or rearm morally, merely because wise men have proved the necessity of doing so. The wise men must go further and set the moral rearmament in motion by embarking on a positive line of action. Men change their hearts by changing their *habits* and not otherwise. The wise men must show them *how*. They must link their ideals to businesslike methods of achieving them. Useless to plead for co-operation in place of strife, unless we can show precisely *how* and *in what* international co-operation can be immediately set on foot. Useless to denounce the tyranny of the War-Machine unless we are prepared with a positive scheme for diverting the forces that now feed that monster into feeding something else.

I suggest the armament race as indicating the most promising point at which the peacemaker can begin his attack. Venturesome as it may seem, I predict that the tyranny of the War-Machine, which makes peace impossible would *begin* to break up at once were means found to divert some portion of the present colossal expenditure on armaments to the formation of an international fund for promoting and financing international co-operation on definite lines.

That idea, which is only one of a large family of ideas pointing in the same direction, I have worked out elsewhere. What is needed is the inventive faculty (which business men can supply as well as anybody else) for creating situations which provide an opportunity for international co-operation on definite lines and reducing them at once from vague aspirations, of which we have more than enough, to businesslike form. In this way a counter-force to that of the War-Machine would come into being, and, growing gradually, perhaps rapidly, would acquire sufficient power to drain off the energies of the war-making interests, take the wind out of their sails and leave them stranded high and dry. Let the idealists go into partnership with the business men.

L. P. JACKS

EDUCATING AND ORGANIZING FOR PEACE

I.—COMMUNITY OF BLOOD OR OF THOUGHT

[H. N. Brailsford stresses educating for peace and advises that it be done right in the High Schools. This entails for the teachers a new style of thinking, one that will analyse existing ideas and assumptions and stress a cultural basis for nationality. But Mr. Brailsford's programme lacks vigour; why not teach the teachers what the following article advocates?—EDS.]

The request of the Editors of THE ARYAN PATH that I should write something on the theme of "Educating for Peace" reached me at a moment of humiliation and defeat. The news is before us, in all its naked ugliness, of the abandonment of Czechoslovakia by the Powers which should have supported her. Peace, in a sense, is preserved. We have escaped the war we dreaded, but we have won this relief by yielding to Hitler's ostentatious parade of military force. We feel, as we bow our heads in shame, that this despot, at the head of a drilled nation that must obey him without debate, is henceforth the master of Europe. Where, then, have we erred, and how shall we educate ourselves for a peace that is the very negation of this achievement—a peace of co-operation and mutual respect?

One may give, first of all, a general answer. All life is education—for strife or for peace. If in our schools we foster in our children's minds the aim of personal success and emulation, and neglect to train them in teamwork for a common social end, we shall educate them for war. Again, if our social structure is based on exploitation and competition, we shall rise with difficulty to any higher ideal in our international life. The landowner or the industrial employer who treats his peasants or his mill-hands as means to the end of his own profit is unlikely to bring anything better than a note of national egoism when, as one unit among many, he makes his contribution to the formation of public opinion. *The world of states is a macrocosm that reflects the character of its component members.* If within them there is a class struggle or the strife of religions or castes, they will repeat the habitual motives of their daily life when they come to deal with one another as nations. Every advance towards the co-operative organization of the life of the village or nation will also pave the way towards international peace.

But the reader will rightly ask me for something more specific and definite. Where in this affair of Czechoslovakia have we all erred? The whole dispute turned round two ideas—nationality and power. We need not enter into the details. Suffice it to say that to-day, under Nazi leadership, the Germans interpret nationality in terms of physical race. All of the same race are blood-brothers who must unite. The only possible union is conceived as the State, and in its turn the state means power. It acts, that is to say, abroad with its army, fleet and air

orce behind it. Starting with these deas, it was inevitable that the Germans should one day claim as heir own the Sudeteniand with its German population. It was equally nevitable that the Czechs should ppose their claim. Why? These Sudeten Germans are not their kinsmen, but they conceive of this erritory, historic Bohemia, as their state and with its ancient oundaries it is their property. Again, to lose its mountains would veaken their military power. Equally if they are rendered defence-ess, the military power of the Ger-nan state for action eastwards will e greatly enhanced.

This hasty analysis has revealed or us three ideas round which this lispute has circled—nationality, roperty, power. Given their current nterpretations wars will rage to he end of the chapter, if indeed, nankind can survive their devasta-ions. But, is nationality necessarily ssociated with the idea of power nd the state? One may give t a purely cultural interpretation. Speaking a common language, Ger-nans, or for that matter Bengalis, ave a common vehicle of thought. That demands the free exercise of ertain kinds of association and co-perative effort—schools, univer-ities and the like. But because two roups of men speak the same ongue and read the same poets, loes it follow that they must live within the same tariff fence or narch in step in the same regiment? o a choice emerges. If we decide hat the sentiment of nationality ests primarily on a common ultural tradition, it can be divorced from the idea of power and its incarnation the State. If that can be done, we eliminate the innumerable wars that have been fought and may yet be fought to draw the map of Europe on correct ethnographical principles.

I might continue the analysis indefinitely. Few of us need to be reminded of the significance of territory conceived as property in the history of imperialism, of all the sources of war the most prolific. Again if one asks why the State is necessarily associated with the idea of power, the answer may be that in varying degrees every state and every society rests on inequality of one kind or another. It is, therefore, an apparatus of coercion : it must accumulate force.

These illustrations may suffice to justify the belief that the first step in education for peace may well be the ruthless and sceptical analysis of all the ideas and assumptions on which we commonly act in our international life. Few of us know what they mean. Rarely in schools and not always in universities are they examined. In their vagueness they gather round themselves some of the most potent emotions of which men are capable. Rightly interpreted, these emotions will serve as the motive power for creative service : wrongly interpreted, they may drive us to destroy one another with a fanaticism that poses as virtue. The few critical intellects who have tried to examine these ideas with a sceptical detachment rank among the heroes of civilization. I am disposed, then, to begin my practical suggestions towards educating us for peace

by suggesting that in every higher school and university the study of sociology should include the frankest examination of such ideas as these.

It is, happily, beginning to be realised that one of the keys to peace lies in the hands of the teachers who instruct us in history. Very few of the text-books of history commonly used in European schools make for peace. Some of them are gross incitements to warlike passion. Some applaud conquests as the proudest achievements of a nation, and ignore its progress in the arts of peace. Most of the books that secure official approval suppress or minimise every accusation that an impartial mind would bring against the past conduct of the statesmen of their own country in dealing with other states. There is the same favouritism in recounting even the pacific achievements of one's own people, and ignoring or minimising those of others. There is no sound rule in these matters save scientific objectivity, but if one errs, let it be on the side of charity towards other nations.

The League of Nations has attempted to bring its influence to bear on the choice of school books, not wholly without effect. But perhaps the happiest model we might follow comes from Scandinavia. The two neighbours, Norway and Sweden, have had their quarrels in the past. Recently they undertook a revision of their school history books in the interest of neighbourly relations. The Norwegians submitted their books for criticism to a committee of Swedish historians, and the Swedes acted likewise. But one might go a good deal further than this in bringing the beneficent influence of history to bear upon international relations. It would be an immense gain if all of us had in our heads some general picture of universal history. With that as our background, the quarrels that fill our daily newspapers would shrink into their due perspective, and we should gain a more scientific habit of mind. Emerson tells us that once as he was heated after a political controversy, he looked up at the stars and heard them say, "Why so hot, my little fellow?" The politician who tried to see his own actions and his nation's interests within the framework of the history of civilization would hear from its Muse the same tranquillising words. The League of Nations might perform a great service if it were to subsidise the writing of such a history for general use. But it would have to deal adequately with the East as well as the West, and with America no less than Europe.

Next to the sound teaching of history for the promotion of peace, we may rank the penetration of our educational systems by the habitual practice of international co-operation. Several schools exist in Europe, notably one in Geneva, that draw their pupils and their staffs from all over the Continent. The children learn each other's habits of thought as well as each other's languages. If as children we play and work together, we shall find no difficulty in collaborating in after-life. The League ought, long ago, to have created an international university, perhaps at Geneva. Rabindranath

Tagore's college at Santiniketan is a distinguished model that might well be followed elsewhere. Several summer schools that meet for a few weeks in the holiday season at sundry centres in Europe serve to promote systematic discussion of international problems among men and women of many nations. But all this as yet is on a pitifully small scale. One day we shall organise as the basis of education for peace the regular interchange of pupils and teachers between neighbouring peoples.

So long as community of blood is the only cement that holds us together, we shall live in strife. It is on community of thought and culture that we must endeavour to build peace.

H. N. BRAILSFORD

II.—FREE TRADE AND DISARMAMENT

[We requested C. E. M. Joad to write on this subject because he is not only a pacifist but also a capable organizer as *Manifesto, The Book of the Federation of Progressive Societies and Individuals*, edited by him shows. As he himself points out, we did not expect him to evolve a programme effecting a *spiritual* revolution. We were looking forward to a mundane remedy born of his fertile analytic mind. The result is somewhat unexpected. Our friend recommends an almost Gandhian programme—disarmament "until England was as defenceless and I should hope, as safe as Denmark, whether other nations followed the example or not".—EDS.]

I am a pacifist. Therefore I believe (a) that war is morally wrong ; (b) that it does not achieve the ends for the sake of which it is waged ; (c) that under modern conditions it is an evil greater than any which may result from a refusal to fight in a war ; and (d) that it will finally cease only when human beings refuse to participate in it. It follows that I believe that the best way to organize for peace is to convince a sufficiently large number of persons that in no circumstances would they be justified in taking part in a war. Now this conviction cannot be engendered by politics. You cannot, in other words, make people into non-resisters by Act of Parliament, or produce the requisite changes in the individual's mind (or spirit) by any form of collective action. It may, therefore, very well be the case that only through a spiritual change which profoundly affects the standards, values and ways of life of the majority of members of Western civilization, can the influences which make for war be overcome. I believe, indeed, that this is so.

When, however, the editors asked me to contribute an article on "Organizing for Peace", it was not, I conceive, on the prospects of insuring peace by producing a revolution in the spirit and outlook of human beings that they wished me to write. I conceive that this was not their intention for two reasons. The first is that I have not the faintest idea—and I think that they know that I have not—how such a revolution is to be brought about. (None of us in the West do know. This incidentally is our tragedy, that

needing a religion to strengthen our spirits and to change our hearts, we are unable either to make a religion for ourselves or to accept any of those that are offered to us.)

The second reason is that, by no stretch of possibility, can such a revolution be effected in time to rescue the West from the war by the nightmare fear of which men's minds are to-day oppressed. You cannot admittedly by collective action bring peace to men's *hearts* ; yet as things are, it is only by collective action that men can be stopped here and now from making war.

What should that action be? What steps, in other words, would I take in the present emergency to preserve peace?

There are, I conceive, three main causes for our present predicament : economic maladjustment, nationalism and fear. The first two go together. The undeveloped territories of the world are controlled by a comparatively small number of nations. These undeveloped territories are rich in raw materials, in metals and rubber and oil. Thus a few nations command a disproportionate number of the world's sources of wealth. The chief among these few is the British Empire. Restless and resentful at this inequitable distribution of the world's territories and raw materials, certain nations on the continent of Europe whose share in them is small or non-existent have developed a clamant nationalism. This nationalism keeps the world in a state of agitation by its continually expanding claims, the object of which is to redraw the map of the world in favour of the " have-nations ". These claims are resisted by the " have-nations " who, by means of the Versailles Treaty, imposed upon the vanquished at the conclusion of the 1914-18 war terms in which no nation, which according to Western standards, retained any vestige of self-respect, could be expected indefinitely to acquiesce.

These terms were sanctified by the Covenant of the League of Nations which, drawn up with the intention of investing the Versailles settlement with the semblance of international justice, sought, under the pretence of punishing the aggressor and upholding international law, to mobilize the armed forces of the world against any attempt to mitigate the injustices which were perpetrated in 1919. Thus the League has come to be regarded by the hungry nations as an association of ex-burglars grown respectable on the proceeds of their loot, whose purpose is to discourage new entrants to their late profession. Here, then, are the root causes of that exacerbated nationalism which derives its power from the wrongs from which the hungry nations believe themselves to be suffering.

In the economic sphere this nationalism results in a policy of national self-sufficiency. By customs duties, by tariff barriers, by currency restrictions, by quotas and favoured nation clauses, each nation seeks to isolate itself from the rest of the world and to stand upon its own feet. Thus a world which modern transport has made economically a single unit is cut across by a thousand and one artificial barriers which are deliberately erected to impede the flow

of international trade by self-sufficient nationalist States, obsolete political entities, with whose jealousy and rivalries modern Europe is cursed. These artificial barriers by putting a spanner into the wheels of international trade intensify the economic difficulties which they are designed to remedy. Thus arises a vicious circle in which more intense economic distress begets more intense nationalism, and more intense nationalism increases economic distress. It also begets fear, for inevitably it leads to an armament race, by which nations armed on an unprecedented scale endeavour to pursue their ambitions under the cloak of protecting themselves from their neighbours. Each nation wants, in fact, to be in a position to blackmail its neighbour by the threat of force, into submitting to the imposition of its own will. It also wants to feel secure in the face of similar threats. Consequently it seeks to be stronger than any combination of forces that is likely to be brought against it. Its growing strength begets fear in those who feel that they are likely to become its victims, and leads them in their turn to increase their strength to a point beyond that of their threatening neighbour. This ever-growing strength the neighbour takes to be a threat to himself. As an aunt of mine recently said to me in comment upon the rival sea powers of continental nations: "We have got to build our fleet up to what they said they'd build theirs up to, if we built ours up."

This, then, is the situation with which any proposals to organize for peace must deal. Such proposals must effect an economic readjustment; they must break the vicious circle of armaments and they must dispel the psychology of fear. I would suggest:

(1) The immediate calling by Great Britain of an international conference to deal with economic grievances.

(2) At this conference I would announce my intention of readjusting the present inequitable distribution of territories and raw materials, and would suggest that these should be administered in the interests of all by an international commission upon which all the major manufacturing nations should be represented.

(3) Pending the establishment of such a commission, I should announce (a) that the British Empire would be thrown open to all the world as a *free* trading area, and that quotas, favoured nation clauses and tariffs would be abolished within that area; (b) that if the Empire were to be attacked, Great Britain would not be prepared to defend it by force, and that as an earnest of this pledge the country would begin to disarm here and now. I should hope that the example of disarmament once set, others would follow, but I should make it clear that I should continue my disarmament programme until England was as defenceless and, I should hope, as safe as Denmark, whether other nations followed my example or not.

(4) I should spend the money accruing from the cessation of rearmament upon measures of non-menacing defence; that is to say, upon the provision of food stores and underground shelters for the whole

population. The cost of providing underground tunnels complete with ventilation, sanitation, and so forth, for the population of Great Britain works out at about £11 per head—£484 millions. We are already spending £350 millions *a year* in preparations for war; whereas I am proposing £484 millions *in all* in measures of non-menacing defence. This policy satisfies the requirements laid down. It effects economic readjustment; it breaks the vicious circle of armaments; and it would dispel fear.

C. E. M. JOAD

The other night
I longed to take flight,
Leave this temple of common clay
And lave myself in the Milky Way,
Mingle my being in its glowing fire
In an ecstasy of desire.

Am I a moth, that I long for a star?
Nay, the moth prefers the candle light;
The lesser flame shines more nearly bright,
But I ache for the greater radiance afar.

I tangle myself in the heavenly zone
That circles itself 'neath the Mother's breasts
With their nourishment of the milk of light,
And drink the immortal draught—alone
With the Fatherhood that the space suggests
Revealed to the mystic sight.

Again I come down to my shuttered clay,
Again I look forth on Earth's darkened day;
Too great the glory of my desire.
Too pure the radiance of Heaven's fire.
The Master Hand gently placed my soul back,
But with infinite mercy left a crack—
Just a little chink through which part of me
May catch a glimpse of the mystery.
It will widen, perhaps, as the years go by
So that once again I may dare to fly
Back to the heart of the Milky Way,
A little longer this time to stay.

Such is the thought that came to me,
And who shall say that it cannot be?

T. L. CROMBIE

THE WAY OF SATYAGRAHA

[Professor P. Mahadevan's article has a message for the East and the West alike.—EDS.]

Some eight years ago, C. F. Andrews prepared for Western readers an exposition of the ideas of Mahatma Gandhi. As it was a sort of curtain-raiser to the actual drama of non-co-operation, which was soon after enacted on the stage of Indian politics, it received considerable notice in the British press. It was the first organised and reasoned statement of those germinal ideas which have since transformed the outlook of many earnest seekers after Truth both in India and in other parts of the world. But then, as now, the unconverted are in the majority; and they are inclined to the view that the practical triumphs of the Gandhian philosophy have been due more to accident than to *necessity*; and that the new doctrine has still to overcome many inherent inconsistencies before it can command general acceptance. It is contended that Hinduism has never enthroned non-violence as the highest or the most efficacious rule of conduct, notwithstanding that Ahimsa is enjoined as a duty; and that Gandhiji has himself weakened his case by conceding that those who *would* bear arms, may do so in the defence of their country. In either case, it is said that the cult of Satyagraha is reduced to the level of many other alternatives which have been tried by mankind with varying success. Thus, in the final analysis, it would seem that we, Indians, are guilty of a patriotic bias in claiming for the Gandhian Way a potency superior to that of all other ethical systems with or without a transcendental point of reference.

If we take the *Bhagvad-Gita* as containing the most inspired exposition of the principles of Hinduism, it will not be difficult to prove that it lends no support to the cult of non-violence; indeed, it contains a seemingly unanswerable refutation of it. The enlightened and pious Hindu of to-day seems to be impaled on the horns of a dilemma. He has either to forswear the Gandhian way or to doubt the plenary inspiration of the *Gita*, or if he has not the courage for it, to take refuge in allegoric interpretations of it. Before the country paid any heed to the voice of Gandhiji, the revolutionary movement (particularly in Bengal) found apologists who condoned violence with a certain spiritual exaltation which derived its sustenance from the divine certitudes uttered in the *Gita*. Even without reference to Gandhiji's ideas, how could such an attitude be squared up with the doctrine of Ahimsa?

For answer, we must go back to a distant past, and trace from thence the evolution of certain specifically Hindu ideas. The first and most commonly understood of them was Ahimsa. It has always involved a two-fold concept, namely, non-injury to life, because of the unity of life. Its primary function was to promote universal reverence for Life,

because of the unseen unity underlying all its myriad manifestations. When it was translated into conduct, it became a categorical imperative; and served to quicken human consciousness into a sense of its ultimate integrity. But in the very nature of the case, such a realization could never be widespread. Hence the practice of the doctrine, in its uncompromising form, was restricted to small communities. Even in their case, it ultimately degenerated into a mechanical assemblage of taboos. As for the majority of the Hindus, it acted as no more than a sub-conscious inhibition that reduced the instinctive violence of individual behaviour to a minimum.

But side by side with Ahimsa was another great idea which Hinduism has elaborated with poetic splendour and philosophic subtlety. It is, that Life originates from Sacrifice, is sustained through Sacrifice and fulfils itself in Sacrifice. Creation itself depends upon the perpetual sacrifice of the *Purusha*, giving us the *Prakriti*. What is even more important, this sacrifice is *vicarious*. Instead of each one of us destroying others that we may live, *we* have been taught to sacrifice ourselves that *others* may live! Here then we have a sea-change coming over violence, and the emergence out of it of something "rich and strange".

The third concept of Dharma, also based on the eternal verities, had a more definitely sociological application. It takes into account differences in aptitudes of human beings, and provides for their working together, not in conflict but in co-operation. It was Sister Nivedita who gave a convincing and beautiful interpretation of the *Varnas* as crystallizing the ideal of chivalry. The discredit into which the Caste system has fallen, fortunately leaves the principle underlying it unaffected; and there is an unmistakable, albeit as yet tentative, drift towards it even in the "advanced" countries of the West.

We thus have three separate strands of the Hindu faith in the concepts of Ahimsa, Harmlessness; Yagna, Sacrifice and Dharma, Law and Order. They have been emphasised sometimes singly, sometimes in pairs, *but never all together.* Asoka's spectacular gesture renouncing war was the manifestation of Ahimsa in politics; the Avatars have taught us by divine example the necessity for vicarious sacrifice; while the Pandavas upheld Dharma on the field of battle, where they were taught to fight with "charity towards all and malice towards none". But before Hinduism could resolve the contradictions, if any, between these concepts, it fell into an eclipse of a thousand years. It has been reserved for us in these days to witness an attempt at a synthesis of them which has galvanized Hinduism into a new and vigorous life. In short, we owe to Gandhiji the fusion of Ahimsa, Yagna and Dharma in one concept, *viz.*, *Satyagraha.* If he has not done this he has done nothing at all!

The next point for consideration is the alleged inconsistency of Gandhiji in permitting those who *would* bear arms to maintain the freedom of their country with the sword. In the first place, there is no

inconsistency at all in telling a man who does not believe in non-violence *not* to fight; for the only result of such advice would be to make him infirm of purpose, and help his enemies to destroy him. But there would be real and fatal inconsistency if Gandhiji had said that the Satyagrahi might oscillate between violence and non-violence. Not only are there many mansions in our Father's House but there are many ways of reaching them. Gandhiji certainly claims that Satyagraha is the most excellent way; but he cannot *compel* any man to choose *his* way, as it were, at second-hand.

Further, we must take into account the peculiar conditions under which he evolved his cultus. The problem as he originally saw it was political, and in a strictly temporal sense, urgent. The emasculation of a people, not so much physically as morally and spiritually had gone to such alarming lengths as to have promoted a pusillanimous acceptance of evil as a national habit. Non-co-operation had a limited objective; it wrested courage from despair, and gave the country a sense of pride in itself which had been unknown for a millennium. We know as a matter of fact that an important section of opinion followed him, attracted by his technique, but indifferent, if not hostile to his basic assumptions. Such people were bound to increase rather than diminish in numbers with the achievement of political independence. Gandhiji's concession is to them, more or less, as the proverbial sop to Cerberus. If the country could achieve its freedom through non-violence, it must be equally possible to preserve it through the same means. For another thing, so long as India is precluded, happily as we may think, from indulging in predatory activities abroad, a national army can never develop the virus of militarism to the extent of creating that vicious circle in which Europe finds itself to-day.

But actually, Gandhiji has advanced very far from the position which he seems to have occupied some years ago. During the last few months, he has made many striking pronouncements on this crucial question which have at least served to clear him from the charge of inconsistency. He has been the most unsparing critic of Congress in office; he has confounded the faithful by his statement that the use of 'repression' in any form for any reason is proof of the failure of Congress to act in the spirit of Satyagraha. He has propounded a scheme for a peace-army or peace-brigade to act as a shock-absorber of mob-violence, so that the community may enjoy immunity from the effects of it. On the analogy of 'Death-squadrons', he wants ordinary citizens to offer themselves to mob-fury, so that out of their immolation, the passions of the mob may first be checked and ultimately refined. He is about to return from a tour of the Frontier where he has spoken to the hardiest and most pugnacious race of men in praise of the non-violent way.

He has thus rounded off his doctrine; but it still remains to

be seen whether it is possible for any government to function without the punitive aids euphemistically epitomised under Law and Order. *The Satyagrahi in opposition is one thing; but in the seats of the mighty he is a different and apparently inferior entity.* In the former case, he can be sublimely indifferent to opposition or numbers; in the latter, he has to reckon with them so long as society is the resultant of a multiplicity of unequal forces. The logical consummation of Gandhiji's doctrine would be a state in which culture had reached such perfection as to render government unnecessary. But such a state of enlightened Anarchy is nothing more than an Utopian dream.

At the present moment, however, the danger to Satyagraha issues neither from its inconsistency nor from its impracticability, but from its abuse by individuals and groups who travesty it in ludicrous or wicked ways. It is in less danger of being discredited by its enemies than by its pretended adherents. Gandhiji himself is well aware of the illegitimate use of his weapon by others; but his warnings and appeals seem still to be unheeded.

P. MAHADEVAN

T. L. CROMBIE

THE ARYAN PATH has lost one of its most devoted servants through the passing of Theodore Leslie Crombie, B.A. (Oxon.), Bar-at-Law. With enthusiasm he shared in the conception of the magazine, with encouraging suggestions he coloured parts of the dim silhouette of its programme and policy and for nine years he spent his energy in labouring with love month after month to make its contents attractive and useful. More, now and again he helped financially to keep the magazine alive. Even his many intimate friends who knew of his connection with the magazine did not realize how unstintedly he spent himself in time, money and work in its behalf. The spring of this devotion was in his conviction of the truths of Theosophy which he earnestly tried to practise, and also to promulgate as a loyal and faithful student-associate of the United Lodge of Theosophists.

He was a lover of India and though born in Aberdeen, Scotland, had made this country his home for over a quarter of a century. More than twenty years ago he wrote :—

> India does not want to extend her territory; she does not demand colossal wealth beyond her needs; she wants to realise on her soil ideals that by silent precept may influence the rest of the world. Not hers the hand to rule Empires, but hers the strength and spirituality to inspire and guide Emperors. But in order to accomplish this she must at least have the management of her own affairs...No disabilities must be placed on Indians as such, and the possessions of the Motherland must not be exploited as a source of wealth to other parts of the Empire. Probably at first with Home Rule, she may make mistakes, but she must learn by these mistakes to realise herself. As she realises herself, more and more will her true spirituality envelop the world bringing a blessing to all nations and all lands.

RAJA-YOGA OR OCCULTISM

By H. P. BLAVATSKY

THE VOICE OF THE SILENCE

Being Chosen Fragments from the "Book of the Golden Precepts", translated and annotated by "H. P. B."

THE THEOSOPHY COMPANY, LOS ANGELES
THEOSOPHY COMPANY (INDIA), LTD., LONDON
AND
51, ESPLANADE ROAD, BOMBAY, INDIA.

THE KEY TO THEOSOPHY

By H. P. BLAVATSKY

This book is a clear exposition in the form of Questions and Answers of the Ethics, Science and Philosophy of Theosophy, and is dedicated by the author "to all her pupils that they may learn and teach in their turn". The importance of *The Key to Theosophy* cannot be overestimated in view of H. P. B.'s comment on it in her magazine *Lucifer*:—

With the present publication of the "Key to Theosophy", a new work that explains clearly and in plain language what our Esoteric Theosophy believes in and what it disbelieves and POSITIVELY REJECTS, *there will remain no more pretexts for flinging at our heads fantastic accusations.*

THE THEOSOPHY COMPANY, LOS ANGELES
THEOSOPHY COMPANY (INDIA), LTD., LONDON
AND
51, ESPLANADE ROAD, BOMBAY, INDIA.

THE ARYAN PATH

The Aryan Path is the Noble Path of all times. The word "Aryan" is not used in its modern political, ethnological and anthropological sense. The Aryan Path stands for all that is noble in East and West alike, from the ancient times to modern days. It stands for the Ancient Way of spiritual development and growth in holiness, rooted in knowledge, and it can be walked by Brahmanas and Mlecchas, by Jews and Gentiles and by philanthropists of any political school.

CONTENTS FOR DECEMBER 1938

RELIGION IS SOUL-FREEDOM
I.—JESUS VERSUS THE CHURCH—*By Bharatan Kumarappa*
II.—CHRIST IN INDIA—*By Jack Common*
CHRISTIANITY AND SOCIETY:
I.—FOUND: SERMONS IN SERVICE—*By May Perry*
II.—THE SOCIAL APPLICATION OF WISDOM—*By F. H. Hill*
THE STAR OF BETHLEHEM—*By Keith Percy*
THE FUTURE OF RELIGION:
II.—THE COMING OF THE FORERUNNERS—*By J. D. Beresford*
OUR COMMON HUMANITY: BARRIERS TO ITS REALIZATION—*By N. K. Bhagwat*
VARIETY IN MYSTICISM:
I.—VAISHNAVA MYSTICISM—*By Matilal Das*
II.—MYSTICISM IN HUMAN RELATIONS—*By Radhakamal Mukerjee*
NIRVANA—*By Barnett D. Conlann*
NEW BOOKS AND OLD—
DEFENCE INVITES WARS—*By Irene Rathbone*
REVIEWS—*By T. L. C.; Swami Jagadiswarananda; W. Stede; R. Das; J. M. Kumarappa; E. H. Brewster; J. C. Kumarappa; Zaki Ali; Ratnam Kumarappa; Kokileswar Sastri; J. Vijaya-Tunga; Jack Common and R. Naga Raja Sarma*
AN AUTHOR AND A REVIEWER—*By S. de Madariaga*
ENDS & SAYINGS

TO APPEAR IN FEBRUARY AND AFTER

THE PROBLEM OF DEATH IN GERMAN LITERATURE—*By Dr. E. Kolm-Bramstedt*
THE PROBLEM OF DEATH IN ENGLISH LITERATURE—*By Philip Henderson*
INDIAN INFLUENCE ON WESTERN THOUGHT—*By Radhakumud Mookerji*
THE HARD-HEARTED MODERNS—*By Humbert Wolfe*
THE USE OF BEAUTY—*By Clifford Bax*
ATLANTIS AND "THE SECRET DOCTRINE"—*By James Bramwell*
THE INDIVIDUAL IN HINDU POLITY—*By V. R. Ramachandra Dikshitar*

Per Annum—Rs. 6 India; 12*s.* Europe; $3 America.
Single Copy—As. 12 India; 1*s.* 6*d.* Europe; 35 cents America.

Printed by M. N. Kulkarni at the Karnatak Printing Press, Karnatak House, Chira Bazar, Bombay 2, and published by K. N. Panday, Theosophy Company (India), Ltd., 51, Esplanade Road, Bombay, India.